NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXLIX.

APRIL, 1894.

PERSONAL REMINISCENCES OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

BY HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL GIBBONS.

I HAPPENED to be the youngest Bishop that attended the Council of the Vatican, and, while my youth and inexperience imposed on me a discreet silence among my elders, I do not remember to have missed a single session, and I was an attentive listener at all the debates.

The Council was held in the left transept of St. Peter's Basilica, which was partitioned off and suitably furnished with all the requirements for a deliberative body. Pope Pius IX. presided in person at the opening, as well as at all the solemn sessions, and a bench of five Cardinals presided at the business sessions, or general congregations. At the close of the first solemn session the Prelates passed out from the council-chamber into St. Peter's Church, and mingled with the crowd of some 50,000 spectators. In advancing toward the front door of St. Peter's, I became separated from Archbishop Spalding, who always favored me with a seat in his carriage. I was as much bewildered as a stranger would be in a London fog, and did not attempt to find my way to the carriage, which was awaiting us in one of the many court-yards around the Vatican. The rain was pouring down in torrents, a carriage could not be secured at any price, and, encumbered as I was with the *impedimenta* of

Copyright, 1894, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cope and mitre, a journey on foot to the American College, a mile or more away, was out of the question. I applied in vain to the occupants of several carriages, but all the seats were engaged. At last, when it was growing dark, a solitary carriage remained on the piazza, occupied by a Bishop. It was my last chance. I requested him to give me a seat, and explained my helpless condition, speaking to him in French, as that was the most popular language among the Prelates. The Bishop looked at me with a good-humored smile, which seemed to say: "I think you understand English quite as well as French." And then he replied to me in English: "The carriage, my lord, is engaged for five of us, but we cannot leave you stranded. We must make room for you." Rarely did our English tongue sound so sweet in my ears, and seldom was an act of kindness more gratefully accepted. My good Samaritan proved to be a Bishop from the wilds of Australia.

When the Council was convened in Rome, December 8, 1869, the Catholic Bishops of Christendom, resident and titular, numbered about 1,200. At an early stage of the Council, the number of Prelates in attendance was 737. Europe was represented by 514 Prelates, North and South America by 113, Asia by 83, Africa by 14, and Oceania by 13 Bishops.

Every continent, every island of importance, every nation on the face of the globe, except Russia, was represented by its hierarchy. The Bishops kneeling together around the altar in the council-chamber, could exclaim with truth in the language of the Apocalypse: "Thou hast redeemed us, O Lord, to God in Thy blood out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation."

No Prelates attracted more general attention than the venerable Patriarchs and Bishops of the East. I may here observe that the Oriental Christians comprise two classes, the schismatics, who separated from the Catholic Church chiefly in the fourth, fifth, and ninth centuries, and are not now in communion with the See of Rome, and the orthodox Christians who acknowledge the judicial supremacy of the Pope. Only the latter had representatives at the Council, though the former had also been invited by Pius IX., but they chose to decline. These venerable Prelates had nothing in common with their western colleagues except their faith. Their peculiar rites and ceremonies, their liturgical and popular language, their dress and long-flowing beards,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stamped them with a personality all their own. Some of them recalled to mind the Patriarchs of old, of whom we read in the Sacred Scriptures; and they might sit for a Moses or an Aaron. The Eastern Christians in communion with the Holy See are divided into the following rites: 1. The Greek Rite, itself subdivided into Pure Greek, Italo-Greek, Roumanian, Bulgarian, Ruthenian, and Melchite Greek; 2. The Chaldean Rite; 3. The Syrian Rite; 4. The Syro-Maronite; 5. The Syro-Malabar; 6. The Coptic, subdivided into Coptic proper and Coptic-Ethiopian.

These Orientals came from the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates, the cradle of the human family; from the banks of the Jordan, the cradle of Christianity; from the banks of the Nile, the home of the oldest historic civilization. They came from Chaldea, from the lands of the Medes, the Persians and the Abyssinians; from Mossul, built near the site of ancient Nineveh, and from Bagdad, founded not far from the ruins of Babylon. They assembled from Damascus and Mount Libanus, and from the Holy Land, sanctified by the footprints of our Blessed Redeemer. What a spectacle they presented, what reverence they excited! Unchangeable as the hills and valleys of their native soil, they wore the same turban, and the same pale and thoughtful countenance that their fathers wore in the time of John the Baptist; they exhibited the same simplicity of manners that Abraham did nearly four thousand years ago, when he fed his flocks in the valley of Mambre and gave hospitality to angels.

The Vatican Council incidentally affords us a most striking and gratifying evidence of the growth of our language among the nations of the earth during the last three centuries, and of the corresponding expansion of the Catholic religion throughout the English-speaking world. We can form a just estimate of this increase by comparing the number of English-speaking Bishops who attended the Vatican Council with the number of the same tongue at the Council of Trent, which assembled three hundred and fifty years ago. At the Council of Trent the whole continent of America was without a single representative, having been discovered only fifty years before. Oceania was then a *terra incognita*. There was no Bishop from Scotland. England sent one Prelate and Ireland three to that council. There were, consequently, only four English-speaking representatives at the Tridentine Synod.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the Vatican Council there was an English Episcopate numbering upwards of one hundred and twenty members. Prelates speaking our tongue assembled in Rome from England, Ireland, and Scotland, from the United States and Canada, from Oceania, the East Indies, and Africa.

Daniel Webster, in one of his speeches in the United States Senate, speaks of England as

> "a power which has dotted the surface of the whole globe with her possessions and military posts, whose morning drum-beat, following the sun and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England."

We may not less confidently affirm that wherever floats the British or the American flag, aye, wherever the English language is spoken, there also is raised aloft the banner of salvation; and there, too, is announced in our own noble and familiar tongue the Gospel of peace and reconciliation. And I venture to hazard the prediction that, at the next Ecumenical Council, if held within fifty years, the representatives of the English language will equal, if they do not surpass, in numbers those of any other tongue.

The question naturally occurs to the reader: What language was the medium of communication among so large and heterogeneous an assemblage speaking different tongues? I answer that the Latin was the official language of the Council. A few words may not be out of place here explaining why the Latin is employed in the Liturgy of the Western Church, and why it was exclusively used in the debates of the Vatican Council. When Christianity was established, Rome was mistress of the civilized world. Wherever the Roman standard was planted, there also spread the Roman tongue, just as the English language is now diffused wherever the authority of Great Britain or of the United States holds sway. The Church adopted in her public worship the language that she found prevailing among the people. And she has very wisely preserved it in her Liturgy, even after it had ceased to be a vulgar tongue, as a dead language is not subject to the gradual changes of meaning which occur in a living tongue. The jewel of faith is best preserved in the casket of an unalterable language.

In like manner, we can easily perceive the utility, I might say the absolute necessity, of the Latin tongue in the delibera-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions of the Council. Had the Bishops no uniform medium to express their sentiments, the Council would have degenerated into a Babel of tongues. Public debate would have been impracticable, even familiar conversation during the intervals of recess between the speeches would have been impossible to a great many, for the Bishops' seats were arranged, not by nationality, but by seniority of rank. But, thanks to the Latin language, which all but a few Orientals understood, each Bishop comprehended the discourses almost as clearly as if they had been spoken in his native tongue.

While the speeches of all the Bishops were intelligible to the hearers, an attentive listener could usually detect to what family of nations the orator belonged. He could tell whether the speaker was a Spaniard, a Frenchman, an Italian, a German, or a Prelate of the English-speaking world, almost as readily as an Englishman can distinguish a Scotchman from a Cockney or a Yorkshireman. The pronunciation or accentuation of certain words, the guttural sound or the soft cadence, was the shibboleth that revealed the nationality of the speaker. Sometimes a pleasant smile would play on the habitually grave countenance of an Italian Cardinal while listening to the language of Cicero uttered with inflection and pronunciation unfamiliar to his ears. The accomplished Bishop of Geneva began a speech with a graceful apology for his French accent: "My voice, Most Reverend Fathers, is French, but my heart is Roman." *

So much for the language. Let us now look more closely at the men. I think I am not exaggerating when I say that the Council of the Vatican has been excelled by few, if any, deliberative assemblies, civil or ecclesiastical, that have ever met, whether we consider the *maturity* of years of its members, their *learning*, their *experience* and *piety*, or the widespread influence of the *Decrees* that they framed for the spiritual and moral welfare of the Christian Republic.

The youngest Bishop in the Council was thirty-six years old. Fully three-fourths of the Prelates ranged between fifty-six and ninety years. The great majority, therefore, had grown gray in the service of their Divine Master. Several Fathers of the Church, bent with age, might be seen passing through St. Peter's Basilica to the council-chamber every morning, leaning with one

* Alloquor vos, Reverendissimi Patres, Gallico sermone, sed Romano corde.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hand on their staff, the other resting on the shoulder of their secretary. One or two blind Bishops could be observed, guided by their servants, as they advanced to their posts with tottering steps, determined to aid the Church in their declining years by the wisdom of their counsel, as they had consecrated to her their vigorous manhood by their Apostolic labors. Several prelates were so much enfeebled by years and infirmities, and so exhausted by travel, that they died martyrs to obedience and duty on their way to their Council; several others expired in the city or while returning to their dioceses.

But to the gravity of years, the members of the Council generally united profound and varied learning. From their youth they had drunk at the fountain of knowledge, and particularly at that of sacred science. There was not a single civilized language, scarcely even a tribal dialect in vogue among any people or race, that was not understood and spoken by some Prelate in that assembly. Every Bishop was familiar with at least two or three languages, and some of them were capable of speaking from eight to twelve. The Primate of Hungary informed me that he employed four different tongues in the administration of his vast diocese of a million of souls, corresponding in Latin with his clergy, and addressing his mixed congregations in the Hungarian, German, and Sclavonian languages. A Vicar Apostolic from China, who sat next to me, said that he was obliged to use six different Chinese dialects in his Vicariate.

Where else could be found a single assembly capable of discoursing in all languages under the sun? Was not this spectacle suggestive of the Pentecostal miracle? And well might the spectators exclaim: "Behold, are not all these who speak Galileans (or, at least, disciples of the Divine Galilean), and how have we every one heard our own tongue wherein we were born? Parthians, Medes, and Elamites, and inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Judea, and Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, and Egypt, and strangers of Rome, Proselytes, Cretes, and Arabians—we have heard them all speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God."

They were men, too, of world-wide experience and close observation. Each Bishop brought with him an intimate knowledge of the history of his country and of the religious, moral, social, and political condition of the people among whom he lived. One

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could learn more from an hour's interview with this living encyclopædia of divines, who were a world in miniature, than from a week's study of books. An earnest and attentive conversation with these keen-sighted churchmen on the social and religious progress of their respective countries was as much more instructive and delightful than the reading of books as a personal inspection of the Chicago Exposition would be in comparison with a description of it in the pages of an illustrated review. The living words left an indelible impress on the heart and memory.

And while I admired their learning and experience, I could not but venerate their apostolic virtues. The great majority of the Prelates had grown old in the service of their Divine Master, and had endured trials and hardships for the faith of Christ. Some were exiles from their Sees for conscience' sake; others were the successors of martyrs, and were destined themselves to wear a martyr's crown. By the enforcement of the Falk laws, or Culturkampf, in Prussia after the Council, Archbishop Melchers, of Cologne, now a Cardinal, was expelled from his See, to which, though still living, he has never been permitted to return. By the same laws, Archbishop Ledochowski, of Gnesen-Posen, in Prussian Poland, who is now the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, was imprisoned for two years. St. Chrysostom says that Paul raised to the third heavens was an object delightful to contemplate, but that Paul buried in a Roman dungeon was still more worthy of our admiration. May we not add that Ledochowski was a conspicuous figure in the Council, but he was still more admired in a Prussian prison?

But of all the Bishops assembled under St. Peter's dome none excited more sympathy and admiration than the Prelates from China and Corea, where persecution periodically breaks out. To them might be literally applied the words of the Apostle: "In journeyings often, perils of rivers, perils of robbers, perils from the Gentiles, perils in the city, perils in the wilderness, perils in the sea. In labor and distress, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness." When travelling from Marseilles to Civita Vecchia by the Mediterranean, on my way to the Council, I happened to get acquainted with a Chinese Bishop. The expression of his pale and thoughtful countenance, with a blending of melancholy and sweetness, shall never be effaced from my memory. His was a face that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

told you at once of sufferings, privations, and fortitude. He remarked to me on the steamer: "I am glad that my journey is near its end, for when I reach Rome I shall have travelled 23,000 miles." He had worked his way for weeks in a zigzag direction through the interior of China till he arrived at the Yang-tse-Kiang, down which he sailed to the mouth, thence made a circuitous voyage to a French port, and finally proceeded from Marseilles to Rome.

Another Bishop, Monsigneur Ridel, was also an object of sympathetic interest. Three of his predecessors in the Episcopate besides several missionary priests had died martyrs to Christianity in Corea, two other Bishops of that country perished from hunger and exposure, and the Bishop himself, after returning to Corea, was confined in an infected prison for five months, and was saved from a cruel death only by the intervention of the French minister. Whatever may be a man's religious faith, his heart will swell with emotion when he contemplates a young levite leaving his native land, his family and kindred, and voluntarily exiling himself in a distant country to preach the Gospel to an unfriendly and a hostile people, adapting himself to their habits and diet, daily carrying his life in his hands, and finally succumbing to disease, or to the stroke of the executioner. With very few exceptions, these priests, after touching Chinese or Corean soil, never return to their native country. The words of Dante may well be applied to them—"All hope abandon ye who enter here."

What heroism is more sublime than this? It is a heroism not culled from the musty pages of ancient hagiology, but occurring in our own days, a heroism not aroused by the sound of martial music, or the clash of arms in the battle-field, or by the emulation of comrades, or the lust for fame or territory; but a heroism inspired by their love for God and their fellow-beings.

Let us now enter the council-chamber for a few moments and observe the bearing of the Fathers toward each other, as well as the leading features of the debates, and then let us note a few of the prominent speakers who took part in the discussions. The conduct of the Bishops toward each other was marked by mutual esteem and by good temper that was rarely ruffled even when the most burning questions were deliberated. The most ample liberty of discussion prevailed in the Council. This freedom

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Holy Father pledged at the opening of the synod, and the pledge was religiously kept. I can safely say that neither in the British House of Commons, nor in the French Chambers, nor in the German Reichstag, nor in our American Congress would a wider liberty of debate be tolerated than was granted in the Vatican Council. The presiding Cardinal exhibited a courtesy of manner and a forbearance even in the heat of debate that was worthy of all praise. I do not think that he called a speaker to order more than a dozen times during the eighty-nine sessions, and then only in deference to the dissenting murmurs or demands of some Bishops. A Prelate representing the smallest diocese had the same rights that were accorded to the highest dignitary in the Chamber. There was no limit prescribed as to the length of the speeches. We may judge of the wide scope of discussion from the single fact that the debate on the Infallibility of the Pope lasted two months, occupying twenty-five sessions, and was participated in by one hundred and twenty-five Prelates, not counting one hundred others who handed in written observations. No stone was left unturned, no text of Sacred Scripture, no passage in the writings of the Fathers, no page of Ecclesiastical History bearing on the subject, escaped the vigilant investigations of the Bishops, so that the whole truth of God might be brought to light.

It is true that, toward the end of the Council, with the view of saving much precious time without prejudice to the freedom of discussion, the original rules were so modified that, on a petition of ten Fathers, the President could propose and the majority could decide to close the debate.

I well remember how, during and after the Council, a good many writers in the public press affected to be shocked and filled with virtuous indignation that there should be any outburst of feeling or even any display of parliamentary contention in a Council of Catholic Bishops. With the Mantuan poet, they exclaimed:

"Tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ?"

Had the deliberations been carried on in a humdrum style, without criticism or opposition on the part of the minority, the outcry against the Council would have been all the louder. Then it would be charged, with a fair show of reason, that there was no spirit or manhood among the Fathers; that they were so many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

figureheads ready to bow at the nod of the Pope. The Bishops were men with human feelings. They were freemen fettered by no compact, bound by no caucus, filled with a profound sense of responsibility to God and their conscience. They were discussing questions, not of a political or transitory nature, but questions of faith and morals, which would not only influence the external conduct, but control the internal assent of themselves and of the faithful committed to their charge. As judges of faith, it was their right, as well as their duty, to examine the sacred records before registering their vote, just as the judges of the Supreme Court examine the statute and common law before rendering a decision. If they had unanimously agreed on all the great questions under consideration without any diversity of sentiment or conflict of words, they would have exhibited a spectacle unparalleled in the annals of civil or ecclesiastical legislation. The history of every great Council of the Church has been marked by intense earnestness of debate. There was not only discussion, but "much disputing" in the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem. There were scenes of controversy, not to say of commotion, in the Ecumenical Councils of Nice, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Constantinople, and Trent. Yet such incidents of verbal strife did not impair the dignity nor lessen the authority of these memorable conventions.

The most important debate in the Council was that on the Infallibility of the Pope. It may be proper to observe here that the discussion was rather on the expediency or opportuneness of defining the dogma than on the intrinsic truth of the doctrine itself. The number of Prelates who questioned the claim of Papal Infallibility could be counted on the fingers of a single hand. Many of the speakers, indeed, impugned the dogma, not because they did not personally accept it, but with the view of pointing out the difficulties with which the teaching body of the Church would have to contend in vindicating it before the world. I have listened in the council-chamber to far more subtle, more plausible, and more searching objections against this prerogative of the Pope than I have ever read or heard from the pen or tongue of the most learned and formidable Protestant assailant. But all the objections were triumphantly answered. When the audience in Rhodes listened to Æschines repeating the speeches he had previously delivered against Demosthenes, they applauded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him; but when they heard the harangue of Demosthenes their plaudits and admiration were redoubled. It was with sentiments like these that the assembled Prelates listened to the advocates of Infallibility after hearing its opponents.

Besides the theological difficulties, there were thinly veiled threats of future hostility to the Church forwarded to Rome by some of the leading governments of Europe if the Decree were enacted; and some of the Bishops expressed their fears that the definition would be followed by schism in certain countries. Every dispassionate reader, whatever may be his religious convictions, must be profoundly impressed, as I was at the time, with the fearless and serene conduct of the great majority, who, spurning a temporizing policy, the dictate of human prudence, were deterred neither by specious arguments, nor imperial threats, nor by the fear of schism from promulgating what they conceived to be a truth contained in the deposit of divine revelation. Since the last vote was taken in the solemn session of July 18, 1870, all the Bishops of Christendom, without a murmur of dissent, have accepted the decision as final and irrevocable.

In every deliberative body, both civil and religious, there is always found a select number who come to the front and are conspicuous among their compeers by their acquired reputation, their ability, or their eloquence. The Vatican Council was no exception to this rule.

Among the prelates who took a prominent part in the debates, I shall single out a few who impressed me as recognized leaders in the assembly; though I may say in passing that there were present many silent Solons, like the venerable Archbishop M'Closkey, of New York, and the present Bishop of Buffalo, whose voice was not heard in the council-hall, but whose influence was felt in the committees.

Cardinal Manning was, unquestionably, the most attractive figure among the Episcopate of England. His emaciated form and ceaseless activity suggested a playful remark made to him in my hearing by Archbishop Spalding: "I know not how Your Grace can work so much, for you neither eat nor drink nor sleep." He delivered the longest oration in the Council, and yet it hardly exceeded an hour, which is evidence of the usual brevity of the speeches. The question is commonly put in America: "How long did he speak?" In Europe they ask: "What did

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he say?" Cardinal Manning's discourse was a most logical and persuasive argument, and, like all his utterances, was entirely free from rhetorical ornament and from any effort to arouse the feelings or emotions. It was a Scriptural and historical treatise appealing solely to the intellect and honest convictions of his hearers.

Ireland had a distinguished representative in the person of Archbishop Leahy, of Cashel, who was, perhaps, the most graceful orator among the English-speaking Prelates. His reply to Cardinal Prince Schwarzenberg, in the Infallibility debate, was a masterpiece of sound reasoning and of charming declamation tinctured with a delicate flavor of Irish wit.

Archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore, and Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, were among the most noteworthy Prelates from the United States. Archbishop Spalding was a member of the two most important committees, in which he was busily employed. He delivered but one discourse during the Council. Archbishop Kenrick spoke Latin with admirable ease and elegance. I observed him day after day reclining in his seat with half-closed eyes, listening attentively to the debates, without taking any notes. And yet so tenacious was his memory that, when his turn came to ascend the rostrum, he reviewed the speeches of his colleagues with remarkable fidelity and precision without the aid of manuscript or memoranda.

Among the many illustrious French Prelates of the Council, Monseigneur Darboy, of Paris, and Monseigneur Dupanloup, of Orleans, held a conspicuous place. Archbishop Darboy was known to enjoy the confidence and to share the sentiments of the Emperor Napoleon on the leading questions discussed in the Council. His heroic and untimely death is still remembered by many. At the close of the Franco-Prussian war, he was arrested and imprisoned as a hostage by the Commune. Mr. Washburne, our Minister to France, made strenuous, though fruitless, efforts to save his life. He was cruelly shot in the prison of La Roquette, May, 1871, and died, his hand uplifted in benediction, and a prayer on his lips for his murderers. That the post of Archbishop of Paris is as hazardous as it is exalted may be inferred from the fact that Monsigneur Darboy witnessed the assassination of two of his predecessors, Archbishops Affre and Sibour.

Bishop Dupanloup was not only an eminent churchman and a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fearless defender of the faith, but also a scholar whose literary attainments had won for him a place among the forty Immortals in the French Academy. Possessed of indefatigable energy himself, he gave, it is said, but little rest to the clerical members of his household. Among the many searchers after light and peace who sought his counsel may be mentioned the famous Prince Talleyrand, whom he had the consolation of reconciling to the church from which he had long been estranged.

The following anecdote I have never seen printed in this country, and I may be pardoned a digression to introduce it here. The intimate acquaintance that Talleyrand enjoyed with the literary celebrities of the day does not seem to have been shared by the mistress of his household. On one occasion the French statesman invited the Scotch historian Robertson to dine with him, and he advised Madame Talleyrand to glance at the works of their expected guest before the day for the dinner arrived. On being introduced to the historian she naïvely inquired of him what had become of his good man Friday. She had evidently confounded Robertson the historian with Robinson Crusoe.

Another notable personage was Cardinal Dechamps, Archbishop of Malines. His brother Adolphus and himself filled analogous positions in Church and State, the one being Prime Minister, and the other Primate of Belgium. The Cardinal brought with him to Rome the well-merited reputation of a great pulpit preacher. His clear and well-modulated voice, his distinct enunciation, his engaging and conciliatory manners, and his habit of judiciously emphasizing leading words and phrases revealed the practised orator and commanded the unflagging attention of his hearers.

Baron von Ketteler, Bishop of Mentz, was as distinguished a champion in the German Empire as Dupanloup was in France. He was a graduate of the University of Goettingen. His face was disfigured by a scar, the result of a duel fought in his university days. A statement has been made which I could not verify, that the duel was fought with Prince Bismarck. He had practised law for some years before he took orders in the Church. In the Council, Von Ketteler was a decided *Inopportunist*, while in Germany he was an earnest advocate of the independence of the Church from the encroachments of the State. Not less conspicuous in defence of infallibility was Bishop Martin, of Paderborn.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cardinal Prince Schwartzenberg, Primate of Bohemia, and Cardinal Simor, Primate of Hungary, were the two most influential churchmen of the Austrian Empire. The double title of Prince of the Realm and Prince of the Church, which Cardinal Schwartzenberg possessed, was still further ennobled by a commanding presence, handsome features, and the gift of eloquence. He strongly contended against the opportuneness of the Decree of Papal Infallibility, and expressed his apprehension that it might result in a schism in Bohemia, a fear, however, which happily was not realized.

There is this striking analogy between the Republic of the Church and the Republic of the United States, that the son of a peasant is eligible to the highest ecclesiastical preferment, including the Papacy itself, just as the humblest citizen of our country may aspire to the Presidency. This truth is forcibly illustrated in the career of Cardinal Simor. Unlike his Bohemian colleague, he sprang from the people, and was proud of recording the fact. He was a member of the Upper House in the Hungarian Parliament, and his experience in that Chamber rendered him one of the most ready and effective speakers of the Council. A touching incident of filial reverence and greatness of soul is recounted of Cardinal Simor, which reminds one of the respect that Solomon paid to his mother when he descended from his throne to greet her. On the occasion of the visit of his mother to him in his palace at Gran, he introduced her to several distinguished personages of the Empire, with every mark of dutiful affection.

In the gravest assembly, an occasional diversion is not unwelcome;

> "A little humor now and then
> Is relished by the best of men."

And the mirth is all the more refreshing when "it is not in the bills," and when its unconscious author is in the most serious mood. One of the Oriental Bishops who did not understand Latin, undertook to deliver a speech. He wrote out his address in his native Arabic, and had it translated into the language of the Council by his Latin secretary. He then read it in a loud monotone, without any regard to accentuation, pronunciation, or punctuation, from beginning to end, without comprehending one word of what he said. And I think that the audience were as much in the dark as the speaker. I am sure, however, that the Bishop

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was not actuated by the ambition of some Congressmen who, despairing of making an impression on their colleagues, are content to have their speeches printed in the *Congressional Record,* and spread among their constituents where they will do the most good.

I shall close these short sketches by a brief reference to Mgr. Strossmayer, Bishop of Bosnia, who was reputed the most eloquent Prelate of the Council. His name figured conspicuously during and after its proceedings, and he felt obliged to repudiate certain hostile sentiments toward the Holy See that had been falsely imputed to him. His discourses were always sure to captivate, if they did not convince, his hearers. His periods flowed with the grace and majesty and musical rhythm of a Cicero. By a masterly arrangement of words, which the genius of the Latin tongue allows so much better than our own, he would bring out the strong points of his discourse at the close of each sentence in some well-rounded phrase. Occasionally in the heat of his oration he would wander from his subject into a forbidden field. An expression of disapproval would come from some Bishops, and then the patient President, yielding to the remonstrance, would stretch his hand toward the bell, the ringing of which was the signal that the speaker was out of order. When the Bishop would see the hand in close proximity to the bell, he would dexterously return to his subject, and thus avert the humiliation of an admonition.

If I have made no special mention of the Bishops of Italy and Spain, it is not from any lack of materials, but from lack of space, for I am transcending the limits I have prescribed to myself. Not a few of the Italian and Spanish speaking Bishops from South America, as well as from the mother-countries, signalized themselves by their ability and eloquence.

Of the College of Cardinals that attended the Council only four survive to-day, one of whom is the reigning Pontiff, Leo XIII. Although Cardinal Pecci did not take part in the public debates of the synod, he was one of its most influential members, and the weight of his learning and administrative experience was felt in the committee to which he was appointed.

May it not be by a particular design of Providence that he who was to be elected the head and judge of his brethren in 1878 should not have been involved in their disputations in 1870, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that he should enter into his high office, joyfully hailed as the harbinger of peace and concord by prelates of every shade of theological opinion?

The year 1870 will be ever memorable for two great events, the Vatican Council and the Franco-Prussian war. Let us contrast the pacific gathering of Christian Prelates with the warlike massing of troops which immediately followed on the continent of Europe. Hosts of armed men were trampling the fair fields of France. The land was reddened with the best blood of two powerful nations. The sound of their cannon spread terror throughout the country. Thousands of human victims were sacrificed, and thousands of homes left desolate; and after a lapse of nearly a quarter of a century, the fires that were then kindled are still smouldering, and the animosity engendered by the struggle is not yet allayed.

A Council of Bishops assembled in the name and under the invocation of Heaven. They met together, not amid the booming of hostile cannon, but amid *Hosannas* and *Te Deums* to God. The pursuits of agriculture and commerce were not suspended during their sessions. The Decrees they enacted for the welfare of the Christian commonwealth are in full force to-day among 230,000,000 people; and long after the framers of them shall have passed away, they will continue to exercise a salutary influence on generations yet unborn.

What does this prove? It proves that the pen and the voice are mightier than the sword and the cannon; that "peace hath her victories no less renowned than war," yea, victories more substantial and enduring. It proves that all schemes fomented by national enmity and a lust for dominion are destined, like the mountain torrent, to spread ruin and desolation along their pathway; while the deliberations of men assembled in the cause of religion, like the Council of Bishops, or in the interests of international peace, like Boards of Arbitration, silently shed their blessings as the gentle dew of heaven, and bring forth fruit in due season.

JAMES CARD. GIBBONS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW PARTIES IN PARLIAMENT.

BY JUSTIN M'CARTHY, M. P.

WHEN I first became acquainted with the House of Commons —more than twenty years before I became a member of that assembly—the conditions of its political life were much more simple than they are at present. There were the two great opposing parties—the Liberals and the Tories. But the Liberals were beginning to be more and more subdivided into Radicals and Whigs. The Whigs were the men who followed Lord Palmerston; the Radicals were those who acted habitually with Cobden and Bright. In every great debate we heard Lord Palmerston, and Lord John Russell and Mr. Gladstone on the one side; Mr. Disraeli and the first Lord Lytton or the late Lord Derby on the other; and then Cobden and Bright as representing the more advanced Radicals. There was also an Irish party, but it was not a party which made any great mark on the actual life of the House of Commons. The time of O'Connell had passed away: the time of Parnell had not come. There were then, roughly speaking, only two great parties in the House—or at all events in the division lobbies of the House; for although Bright and Cobden both disliked and distrusted Lord Palmerston, they were generally compelled to support him in preference to supporting his Tory opponents. They supported him often, too, because of their growing belief in Mr. Gladstone.

Now how many parties are there in the House of Commons? The Liberals and the Tories are still facing each other as before. But there is an Irish party, a Scotch party, a Welsh party and a Labor party. There is a Woman's Suffrage party; there is a Temperance party; there is a Colonial party; there are other parties more or less conspicuous. These are all solid and self-centred bands, whose partisan allegiance is not always to be counted on with certainty by either of the two great parties in the state. About the Irish party I need not say much. It has made itself too well known to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

need an elaborate description of its purpose and its organization. The readers of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW know very well that it is devoted to its own principles, and that it would accept Home Rule from either Liberal or Tory. The Scottish party is not as yet so compact and so resolute in its organization; but its time will come. Its ultimate object is Home Rule for Scotland. The immediate object of the Welsh party is the disestablishment of the State Church in Wales—later on, no doubt, it will ask for Home Rule for Wales. Nothing could be more remarkable and more interesting than the growth of these two national parties in the House of Commons. They have both been inspired directly by the success of the Irish National movement. When I was first observing the House of Commons no one ever heard of a Scottish party or a Welsh party. More than that, when, fifteen years ago, I first entered the House, no Scottish or Welsh party had yet been heard of. One of the younger and more energetic leaders of the Welsh party used to be called the Parnell of Wales. The term was significant. The Scottish band and the Welsh party do not as yet try to exert much force as cross-currents in the politics of England.

The Temperance party—the party in favor of prohibitory legislation as regards the sale of intoxicating liquors—has grown to an immense power in the state. Thus far its members have habitually acted with the Liberals, because they believe there is better hope for their cause from the Liberals than from the Tories. But they would at any moment forsake the Liberals and stand by the Tories if the Tories were to promise them a full measure of local option and the Liberals were to refuse it. They would be justified in such action by the very conditions of their existence. They are, like the Irish Nationalists, a party formed for one distinct purpose, to the promotion of which all other considerations are secondary. A few years ago they were, like the old-fashioned Home Rulers, a party that merely got up an annual debate and took an annual division. This, at least, they seemed to be to most members of the House of Commons. Once in each session they brought in a bill for the prevention or restriction of the sale of intoxicating liquors, and the question was discussed and a division was taken and the Prohibitionists were left in a small minority, and the House heard no more about the matter until the next session. I know men who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

used to vote with the Prohibitionists because they said it looked well to be on the side of temperance and the prohibition bill could not possibly do any harm because it never could pass. In the meanwhile the temperance men were exerting themselves all over the country, in every city and in every village and at every election. The press was for the most part against them, but the pulpits were for the most part with them. They got hold of a new and a taking principle, a new and a taking name. They made their agitation one in favor of "local option." It was to be left to a certain majority in each community to say whether the sale of intoxicating drinks should or should not be permitted there. Many a man who has no particular faith in the suppression of drunkenness by legislation finds it hard to say why the majority in any community should not be allowed to determine whether they will or will not allow drinking shops to be established among them. At one time it was thought that the power of the publicans was irresistible at the elections, but of late many people have begun to doubt whether the temperance men are not the stronger influence of the two. It is certain that of recent years the official leaders of the Liberal party have determined to defy the publicans and to translate as soon as they can the principle of local option into legislation. The present government are pledged to some adaptation of the principle. At one time even a man like Mr. John Bright, an austere worshipper of temperance, a man who never had a decanter or a wineglass in his house, was unable to see his way to going all the length with the followers of Sir Wilfrid Lawson.

Sir Wilfrid Lawson is the leader and the inspiration of the Local Option party. The party is very happy in having such a man to lead it. If a writer of farce or comic novel were to set about describing the leader of such a party he would be certain to paint a picture of a man curiously unsympathetic with any form of human weakness; a man absolutely devoid of any sense of humor—a sour, or what the Scotch would call a "dour," man. Such a man would simply have wearied and disgusted the House of Commons, which dearly loves to be amused and especially detests to be sermonized or bored. Sir Wilfrid Lawson is one of the most humorous men, one of the most inveterate makers of jokes in the House of Commons. He is bubbling over with fun. He can scratch off in a moment a rattling poetic epigram or par-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ody. He puts his gravest truths in the delightful form of a jest or a story. The House cannot but hear him. Nobody wants not to hear him. All the time he is absolutely in earnest—only it is part of his nature and perhaps also part of his purpose never to be dull, never to weary the House. So he has always his audience ready to hand—his strongest opponents are only too glad to hear him. Let any one who understands what English parliamentary life is, think what it is for a party to have a leader whom everybody wants to listen to. Sir Wilfrid Lawson comes of a fine old North of England family; of what its people love to call the North Country. He is, I believe, a rich man, and I have heard that he spends every year large sums of money in the promotion of his cause. He has wrought so far a wonderful success. The Liberal government have had to set aside his measure for this session, because they had too many things to do which could not be put off. But a man has almost carried his point when he has prevailed upon a Liberal government to adopt his principle and pledge themselves to carry it into legislation. I am not myself greatly enamoured of the principle. I am not very confident of its ultimate effect. I have made careful studies, at different times, in the United States and in Canada—studies extending over nearly five and twenty years—which have not gone far to encourage my faith in any form of prohibitory legislation. But I am not blind to actual facts in social movements and in Parliament. I see that the experiment of local option has to be tried in England. I see that it has become a question which is capable of making and unmaking ministries; and I see, too, that it is a principle which has grown to an immense popularity in the country. I must say that the success of the movement thus far is due in great measure to the leadership of Sir Wilfrid Lawson.

I have no occasion to say much about the Woman Suffrage movement. It has been going on for some years. It has not lately made any conspicuous advance in the House of Commons. This is partly due to the fact that the organizers of the movement have been very patient and have not been willing to thrust themselves into the forefront of parliamentary agitation. I have, for the sake of one political cause at least, good reason to feel grateful to them for not having tried to obstruct and interfere with the action of the Liberal government. Their self-restraint

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ought to be taken into consideration, and with grateful recognition of their forbearance, at some early period. If it is not, they will have every justification for assuming an independent and a resolute ground of their own. The House of Commons is, unfortunately, too often like the crowd at the gallery door of a theatre when a popular piece is on. If you do not crush forward you are certain to be left behind.

The representation of Labor in Parliament is, of course, not a new thing. It dates from the year 1874. At the general elections of that year the Liberals, headed by Mr. Gladstone, went out of office, and the Tories, led by Mr. Disraeli, came into power. The Tories were full of gladness and even of exultation. If only they could have foreseen! That election brought in the first Labor candidates—avowedly Labor candidates—who ever sat in the House of Commons and were enabled by their class to maintain such a position. That election, too, brought back Mr. Isaac Butt to the House of Commons after a long absence, and brought with him, too, the first utterance of the name of Home Rule. The two Labor candidates returned to that Parliament were Mr. MacDonald, a man long since dead, and my friend Mr. Burt, who is still in the House and who is now and was once before a member of a Liberal administration. No man in the House of Commons, I will answer for it, is more respected there than Mr. Burt. Mr. Burt was a workingman in the mines. He managed to educate himself somehow, and is now much better educated, taking him all round, than many a man who has gone through a full course of University training. In 1874 Mr. Disraeli offered his congratulations to the House of Commons on the fact that they had at last two representatives of labor in their midst. I do not think the congratulation was insincere. Disraeli had a sort of sentimental sympathy with the workingman. He tried at one time to call into existence a multitudinized Conservative workingman. Mr. Bright, Radical as he was, did not seem to be inclined to the introduction of the Labor candidate—as a Labor candidate. He was opposed on principle, he said, to the idea of representation by class interests. He was opposed to the representation in Parliament of the railway interests, the landlord interests, the brewers' interests—and so he was doubtful about the labor interests. The answer of the Labor candidates would have been only too obvious.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The House of Commons had got the representation of the railway interests, the landlord interests, the brewers' interests, the army interests, the navy interests, and many other interests besides, and could not possibly get rid of them—and what conceivable reason could there be for refusing to organized labor some representation of its interests? The case was clear, and the Labor candidates became more and more successful—and even the rural laborer soon found his representation. Men like Mr. Cremer, Mr. Howell, Mr. James Rowlands, and many others came in to swell the representative influence of the artisan in cities, in mines, and in dockyards, and Mr. Joseph Arch was sent into the House to speak up for the cause of the rural laborer. The Irish National party, the Scotch National party, the Welsh National party have now each and all their own Labor representatives in the House of Commons. Clearly the principle of Labor representation has "caught on"—has indeed prevailed against all adversaries, all odds, and all objections.

The most conspicuous man among the newer members of the Labor party is undoubtedly Mr. John Burns. I have great admiration and respect for Mr. John Burns, and a firm belief in him. He has about him the charm of a strong, self-reliant manhood — he is above all things a man. You can see this in his dark, soft, gleaming eyes. They are eyes which invite confidence. John Burns is a working engineer who has led a toiler's life, afloat and ashore and under various conditions. He has worked along those mysterious African rivers which are associated in the minds of most of us with the explorings of Stanley and of Emin Pasha. He has worked in London sheds and yards. He is a fine and a powerful speaker, and can control a vast meeting of workingmen with irresistible force. He is a great democratic influence, and political parties and social organizations can hardly reckon without him. He seldom speaks in the House of Commons, but when he does speak he speaks well and goes straight to the point. He never speaks but on some subject which he thoroughly understands, and about which he has something important and direct to say. He has a fine and even thrilling voice, and one always feels that some day when his time comes and his own question is uppermost he will make a great speech. For the present that time has not come, and John Burns has given loyal and devoted support to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Home Rule Bill. The natural defect of many such men in the House of Commons would be to think of nothing but their own cause. One who has been long engaged out of doors in a particular cause is apt, if he gets into the House of Commons, to lose all sense of perspective and proportion. He does not see that something else has to come first. He will not see that anything else ought to come first. So he persists in merely trying to beat his own drum and to prevent others from rattling their drums at all. He becomes like a player of cards who insists on playing out of his turn. Thus he puts people against him and even perhaps against his cause. He sinks very often into a mere "crank." I have known honest and gifted and devoted men become utter failures in the House of Commons—failures for themselves and for their cause—through this fatal misconception. John Burns has none of this weakness. I do not believe he would surrender a single principle of his cause for all the governments and all the political parties in the world. But neither would he injure another great cause or show himself impatient with it or unconcerned about it because it happened to be in before him. When John Burns came into Parliament at the last general elections, he found Home Rule in possession of the field. Nothing on earth could have displaced it. Even that great disorganizer of English domestic reforms—a foreign war—a war between England and some foreign State—could not have pushed Home Rule from its place. Therefore, John Burns, being a sturdy Home Ruler already, threw his energies and his heart into the task of advancing Home Rule. He worked for it with unceasing courage and good sense, both in public and in private. He never missed a chance of speaking for his own cause; but he recognized the fact that the Home Rule cause "had the floor," and he made no effort to impede it, but, on the contrary, helped it cheerfully in every way that came within his power.

John Burns, of course, represents the artisan order. Joseph Arch represents the rural laborer. Joseph Arch was a mere farm laborer himself. He does not pretend to be anything but a farm laborer now. He is a sensible, solid man who has the historical merit of having first taught the English rural laborer to form organizations—trade organizations—as their fellows in the cities and towns had already done, and to fight the cause for themselves. Arch has told me that he had practically no education, and indeed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there was very little school education of any kind going for the rural laborer in his younger days. But he managed to learn a good deal all the same—one can learn a good deal if he has a will that way without the help of a village schoolmaster. Arch devoured books and studied mathematics of nights when his work in the fields was done. He is a man of deep-rooted, natural, serious piety, and for a long time acted in the capacity of a volunteer Methodist preacher among his people. He thus acquired a forcible and sustained style of speaking which impressed his audience when he began to deal with politics, and, which was of more importance, he had also acquired the full confidence of all who knew him. Under his impulse and his care the agricultural movement became an influence and a power, and in due course of time he was sent into Parliament to advocate its objects and its claims. He had an early sympathy with the condition of the Irish peasantry. Only the other day he was telling me how he met some of the arguments against the annual immigration of the Irish reapers and other agricultural laborers into the English counties during harvest time. Many English laborers complained bitterly of this invasion of competing labor from Ireland and its effect upon the wages of Englishmen. "Don't blame the Irish laborers," Arch was wont to argue; "blame the Irish landlords and agitate against them. Blame the man in the big house yonder and others like him. He is an Irish landlord and draws all his fine income from Ireland, and he hardly ever goes to Ireland, and his agent screws up the rents in Ireland so high that the farmers could not pay them and live, and the laborers could not exist at all if they did not cross over every harvest to England and Scotland and try by hard work to get a few pounds to keep their wives and their children alive during the long winter." Arch has always been a sturdy Home Ruler and he is of course an ardent radical. He is a simple, straightforward man. He wears even now a costume very much like that of an ordinary English peasant, and has not the slightest idea of claiming to be anything above his class. If there were in England that institution which a romantic young aristocrat in one of Disraeli's novels yearned for—an "Order of Peasants"—then assuredly such an order would be proud of my friend Joseph Arch. There is nothing sour or grim about him; not any fanaticism, except, perhaps, in his dislike for the Tories. "Nothing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good for the people ever came of *them*" he stoutly maintains. Nothing of their own inception, perhaps. That is probably what he means.

Newest of all the parties in the House of Commons is the Colonial Party. The Colonial Party is composed of members of Parliament who were born or brought up in some of the colonies, or have lived much of their lives there, or have great pecuniary or other interests in the colonies, or have travelled there and made colonial questions a study on the spot, as Sir Charles Dilke, for instance, has done. The chairman of the party is Sir John Gorst, who lived a long time in New Zealand and has the peculiar distinction of being the only member of Parliament who can speak the Maori tongue. The object of the party is naturally to look after the interests of the colonists in Parliament, where of course I need hardly say they have no direct representation; and to consider how to deal with the growth of the principle of federation, a principle which is becoming a burning question throughout England's great colonial possessions. There are some born Australians in the House of Commons. There is, for example, Mr. McArthur, one of the whips of the present government; and there is the younger Mr. Curran. There are several men who spent the best part of their lives in Australia, like Mr. Henniker Heaton, the elder Mr. Curran, and Mr. J. F. Hogan. I cannot remember at the moment whether we have any prominent Canadian, except my friend the Hon. Edward Blake, who held for many years a commanding position in the Dominion Parliament. Then we have men deeply interested in South Africa, like Sir Donald Currie and Mr. Rochfort Maguire—in short, we are very well provided with unofficial representatives of our colonial system. Nothing could be more natural than that these should desire to band together and form an organization to watch over the interests of the multifarious and far-divided colonies. So far as I can see, the official representatives of the colonies in London—the Agents-General and others—do not seem to take very kindly to this new organization. Officials of any kind or class are not, I suppose, always ready to welcome any non-official intervention or even participation in what they regard as exclusively their own concern. But the men who have formed the Colonial party are not at all likely to be put out by a little chilliness at the beginning on the part of the regular

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

officials. The truth is that nothing is to be done in the House of Commons now without a special party to look after its interests and to press them, and to push them, and to drive them, until at last they get a place in the front. Nothing can be done without such organizations—I should not like to say what may not be done by their aid and by their energy.

A strong organization in Parliament and outside it will now make any government do almost anything. It sometimes takes one's breath away to observe the rapidity with which conversions are made now on either side of the House. We had a remarkable instance of this lately. While the Conservatives were last in office they were pressed to pass a certain measure in favor of the interests of the Irish tenantry. The leaders of the Conservative government in both Houses delivered the most positive declarations that on no account would they consent to pass any such measure. The supporters of the measure were not daunted. They kept up their agitation—and with what result? The strong Conservative government brought in the measure and passed the measure in that same session! And what happened afterwards—the other day in fact? Lord Salisbury, the late Prime Minister, denounced the self-same measure in terms the strongest and the bitterest that even he could use. But why was this? Because the rapidity of his conversion to the principle of the measure had been so sudden that in a few months he had totally forgotten all about it. He had forgotten that he was converted, and had even forgotten that the measure he was denouncing was his own measure, and the measure of his own government! How long is it since nearly all men in authority on both sides of the House were declaring the demand for an Eight-Hour bill to be a demand not worthy of serious consideration? And now—do not most of them think it quite worthy of serious consideration? There would seem to be a regular process gone through now by the leaders of Parliament on both sides with regard to all great popular demands. The first process may be described in the words—"Your demand is absurd; we cannot even listen to it—and besides you have no backing in the country." The second is. "Come along, my fine fellows, and let us talk this over—there is very likely a good deal of sound practical sense in what you are saying—and there are such a number of you anyhow." The final utterance is: "Why, of course, we will help you to get your bill.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We were always in thorough sympathy with you—we fail to understand how any one could have thought otherwise; and, besides, the general elections are coming on, and who can tell what the other people"—the Liberals, or the Tories, as the case may be—"might take it into their heads to do?" For I feel bound to say that the rapidity of these occasional conversions is just as remarkable on the one side of the House of Commons as on the other. Nor does all this happen by any means because either Conservative or Liberal leaders are consciously or naturally inclined to be indifferent to popular demands or to fail to render justice. But with the constant growth of new claims and new troubles in our complicated social and political existence, leaders on either side are not able to keep up with all the new questions that press upon them for attention. The House of Commons has far too much to do and its leaders cannot attend to half the work for which they are expected to arrange. Therefore the earliest chance is for the stoutest and boldest claimant. One may see at an English railway station a poor porter of whom a dozen people are making frantic inquiries all at once. He is bewildered and can answer none. Suddenly some strenuous person breaks through the crowd, seizes the porter's arm, keeps fast hold of him, will not let him go—and gets his answer. Thus it is with English agitation and the leaders of an English Government.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REFORM IN THE CONSULAR SERVICE.

BY THE HON. WILLIAM F. WHARTON, EX-ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

THE consular service of the United States has received much attention of late, at least in certain sections of the country, not so much from the development of any sudden public interest in the service itself as from the rapid and violent manner in which an almost complete change in its personnel had been wrought. This change was the immediate result of a transfer of the control of the national government from the Republican to the Democratic party, and had itself been for the most part accomplished in the unprecedentedly short period of time of four months at the beginning of the new government. It was therefore but natural that the unusual upheaval and overturning of the service within so short a space of time should be embraced as furnishing an admirable opportunity to compare the incoming and the outgoing governments in the light of previous acts and declarations bearing on the extension and enforcement of the spirit of civil-service reform.

Ordinarily the constitution and condition of the consular service of the United States are subjects of entire indifference to the citizens of the United States. In times marked by less energy of executive action in regard to it no particular notice is taken of the peculiar characteristics of the service, and nobody turns his attention to it unless he is desirous of occupying some post within its circle himself, of procuring such a position for some one of his friends, or of obtaining some assistance from a member of it when in need or alone in a foreign country. The consular reports are little known and little read except by those who are interested in certain business enterprises in the countries whence they proceed, or by those at whose instigation the con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suls have been instructed by the Department of State to render them. The consular despatches to the Department of State are mostly of a confidential and private nature, and the public has ordinarily little knowledge of their existence, much less any idea of the value of their contents. It seems to be the common opinion that anybody can fill a consular office, and it is curious to note how the character of the applicants for these offices has reflected the popular sentiment. With some exceptions, of course, they have been largely made up of politicians in the narrowest meaning of the term, of broken-down and unsuccessful professional or business men, of invalids, of men of moderate means who desired to stay abroad to educate their children and at the same time wanted some occupation for themselves as a pastime, and sometimes of men whose sole claim to an appointment was that they had worn out the patience and endurance of their friends in this country by their worthlessness, and were to be sent away to free their friends from the burden of caring for them. It very rarely happens that a man offers himself for appointment to the service because he is attracted by its character or hopes to make it his profession. As a rule the service is entered into as a makeshift to tide over a difficult season, or as furnishing an opportunity to study for a time in a foreign country, or to recuperate from the hard work and cares of a professional or business career. The reason for this is of course very apparent. No right-minded young man, with his life before him, and with all the hopes and ambitions that that implies, will voluntarily take up with a service which offers no stability of tenure in office, and in a large majority of its posts presents no reasonable expectation of furnishing more than a bare subsistence at the best for his old age, nor will a man of riper age, if he has any prospects whatever in the world, sacrifice what he has and enter, as a profession, a service which presents to him so poor an outlook.

It is not intended by the foregoing to convey the impression that the consular service of the United States is wholly bad. There are good men in the service, and their work is valuable, and their influence and example are admirable. But this is not enough to those who have the welfare and the improvement of the service at heart. They desire to place the consular service on a securer and broader foundation, either because they have had experience in it and desire to see remedied the evils which that experience has taught

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them to recognize as existing, or because they are interested in it as a branch of that government to which they are wholly devoted. They realize that with the growth in power and wealth of this country its position in the great family of nations is growing daily of greater importance, and that its commercial interests are of more and more vital interest. They know that its influence commercially depends in a marked degree upon the character and bearing of its commercial representatives abroad, which its consuls are; and as the commerce of the country increases so the necessity arises of insuring a more perfect representation of its commercial interests in foreign countries, and a fuller and more competent assistance in the development of its commercial relations. They are always looking earnestly for an improvement of the service. Now there are at least three directions by which the consular service can be approached with a view to improvement; namely, the manner of appointment, the tenure of office, and the compensation. The limits of this paper will allow only a cursory glance at a few suggestions which are believed to be pertinent to these subjects.

The Constitution provides, in Article II, Section 2, that the President shall appoint consuls by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and one of the first duties of the incoming President, under the present practice, is to see to the filling of these offices. The persons to be appointed are generally agreed upon by the President and his Secretary of State, the latter being the officer under whose instructions the future consul is to do his work. The President naturally has little time in the first months of his administration to attend, himself, to these appointments, and the Secretary of State has largely within his sole control the selection of the persons to be recommended for favorable action by the President. The Secretary of State is, in the ordinary course of events, entirely new to the duties of his office. It very seldom occurs in present times that he has had any diplomatic or consular experience whatever, and he can know but little, if anything, about the duties of a consular officer, and he is ignorant of the kind of men who should be sent respectively to the different posts. In the exercise of the best judgment he can form, he cannot know, except from a vague confidence in a man's ability, that he is in any way suited to the position for which he is named; and yet he is expected, under the present

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practice, to select the persons to be appointed to the greater number of consular offices within the first six months of his incumbency. The applicants, moreover, themselves, for the most part, are strangers to the service. They have no knowledge of its requirements, nor can they judge of their own fitness for the positions to which they lay claim. Naturalized citizens seek to be accredited to the country whence they originally came, and persons living in the United States on the borders of Canada petition to be appointed to a post just over the boundary line from their home; the former because they desire to revisit their native land, and the latter in order that they may live and carry on their business at home, slipping across the border when it is convenient to attend to consular matters, thus evading the spirit, at least, of the rule which forbids consular officers receiving salaries in excess of $1,000 from transacting business within their districts. No examination is made into their qualifications. Some few may have been in the consular service before, but usually it is their political or social influence, and not their experience, which eventually secures a new place for them. Political backing brings better results than the claims of previous experience and of good service. The most the appointing power can do is to make the sponsors vouch for the character and the ability of the applicant, and hold them responsible if their representations eventually are proved to have been false.

There can be no question that the present method of selection as applied to the existing consular system is bad. If there is to be no change in that system, some different method from that which now exists should be devised whereby the wheat could be separated from the chaff, and only men who have been proved to be fit in character and ability and attainments presented to the President for his selection, free as far as possible from political pressure. But how to determine the fitness is the stumbling, block. This might be done by examination conducted under the direction of the Civil-Service Commission, only persons who are certified by them to be eligible for appointment; but among other objections to this method it is not at all clear that it would be a satisfactory manner of selecting the fittest person, because, as can be easily understood, there are elements which go to make up a good consular officer which could hardly be ascertained or determined by such an examination. There is no advantage in making

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a change for change's sake only, and it seems that the method of selection might with safety be left as it is at present, if only the system of the service were so changed that the tenure of office in the service itself were securely fixed to last during good behavior. By this is meant that the service should be so organized that if a man were once appointed to any consular office he should thereby become a member of the consular service during good behavior and be removable only for cause, not necessarily to remain always at the port to which he was originally appointed, but subject from to time to time to be transferred by the President from one port to another, as it might be deemed best for the interests of the service. If the elements of permanency of tenure and of adequate compensation were assured, there would, in the nature of things, be few vacancies at any one time, and at the time of a change of administration there would be no more than at any other. The pressure upon an incoming administration would be avoided, there would be time in which to make a proper selection, and the knowledge that the appointment was to be made for good behavior would place a greater responsibility upon the appointing power and upon the persons recommending the applicant, while correspondingly greater care would be exercised both in the selection and in the recommendation. Moreover, it seems inevitable that with fixity of tenure joined to proper compensation would come a better class of persons seeking appointment.

The tenure of office of consular officers now is dependent solely upon the will of the appointing power and has long been governed by the exigencies of political expediency. It would not be worth the while for Congress to change this and fix a period of time by statute unless at the same time they increased the pay for the different offices. The fixity or certainty of tenure must go *pari passu* with an increase in pay. What is wanting is to tempt able and stirring men to enter the service for what it can offer them as a life career, and it cannot be expected that such men would find any inducement in the assurance of a permanency of service at an inadequate compensation. With the exception of a comparatively few posts the compensation at present allowed is totally inadequate to the proper or, in many instances, decent maintenance of the dignity of the officer or of the office. A man of humble means must be satisfied with a humble position in the community in which he lives, and many persons are perfectly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

content to occupy such a position so far as they individually are concerned, and their being so is a subject of reproach to them. But if the representative of a great nation, in a foreign country, is unable for lack of means to maintain himself in a manner similar to the like representatives of other nations, it is a reproach to all men of the nation which he is sent to represent. Of course it is always possible to send somebody of private means to the places where the compensation is too small for a man to live properly without such means, but assuredly nothing could be more undemocratic and contrary to the true spirit of all of the institutions of this country than to have a branch of the public service in which the compensation of most of the offices is so small that for the sake of the dignity of the country abroad they can only be filled by persons of independent fortune.

There are in all about seven hundred and seventy-seven consular offices, of which about three hundred and thirty are principal offices, so called, the remaining four hundred and forty-seven being designated as consular agencies. A consular agency is subordinate to the principal office within whose jurisdiction it comes. It is created ordinarily at the suggestion of the principal consular officer, or of the people of the place itself, with the consent of the Department of State, and in almost every instance the agent is nominated by the principal officer and approved by the Department of State. The agent is paid solely from the fees received and is almost invariably a citizen of a foreign country engaged in business in the place where he is agent, often hardly able to speak a word of English, who accepts the place simply for the honor and position which come to him from being the representative of the United States in the locality to which he belongs. As has been intimated, he is paid no salary, but obtains what emoluments he can from that amount of the fees or receipts coming to his office which he is allowed to retain by his superior officer, which amount is usually fixed by agreement between himself and such officer. It should be remembered in this connection that the superior officer has named him for the agency, and is entitled under the regulations to pocket his share of the fees coming from his agencies as unofficial fees up to $1,000 in amount. Ordinarily the purpose of creating these agencies is to accommodate merchants who desire near them a consular office for the authentication of invoices of goods exported to the United States, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seek very naturally to avoid the delay and expense which may be caused to them if they are obliged to apply to the principal office which may be at some distance from them. The business of the shipper of goods to the United States has been the governing reason for the creation of the consular office, and the impossibility of finding a citizen of the United States to take the office for the compensation has obliged the government to resort to the device of a consular agency.

Besides the manifest impropriety of having a foreigner to represent in his native place the commercial interests of the citizens of this country, it can readily be seen that inasmuch as the principal officer shares in the fees collected by his agent the temptation to the former to lend his influence in favor of the creation of agencies within his district, and thus help out his meagre and inadequate salary, is often great. Fees which naturally in the absence of an agency would be collected for services rendered at the principal office, and which would be turned in that case into the Treasury of the United States, are in this manner diverted, and being collected for services rendered at the agency are divided between the principal officer and his agent. It would be most advantageous that all consular agencies should be abolished, and that the official fees which now go to their support should go to the principal office, which ought in every case to be a salaried one, and be turned into the Treasury with the other official fees which come to that office. If these agencies were abolished there would then remain three hundred and thirty principal offices, of which two hundred and thirty-seven are now salaried, and ninety-three receive no salaries. These last are compensated entirely by the official and unofficial fees which they may from time to time collect.

The highest salary paid is $7,500, and that amount is paid only at Seoul, Korea, where the Consul-General is also Minister Resident, and consequently occupies a diplomatic position with all the expenses incident thereto. The Consul-General at Athens, Bucharest, and Belgrade is paid $6,500. He is also Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Greece, Roumania, and Servia, and serves in all the above offices for one and the same salary. The Consul-General at Havana receives $6,000, and the Consul-General at Melbourne $4,500. There are twelve offices where $5,000 are paid, viz.: Rio de Janeiro, Shanghai,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paris, Calcutta, Hong Kong, Liverpool, London, Port au Prince, Boma, Teheran, Cairo, and Bangkok (where the Consul is also Minister Resident); seven offices where $4,000 are paid, viz.: Panama, Berlin, Montreal, Honolulu, Kanagawa, Monrovia, and Mexico; seven where $3,500 are paid, viz.: Vienna, Amoy, Canton, Tien Tsin, Havre, Halifax, and Callao; thirty-one where $3,000 are paid; thirty where $2,500 are paid; and fifty-one where $2,000 are paid. The remaining ninety-five of the salaried officers receive salaries of only $1,500 or $1,000 per annum.

Consular officers are not allowed their travelling expenses to and from their posts, no matter how distant the latter may be. They are simply entitled to their salaries during the transit, provided they do not consume more than a certain number of days *in transitu*, which number is fixed by the Secretary of State, nor are they allowed to transact any business in the place to which they are accredited where their salary exceeds $1,000. They are allowed a certain sum of money for rent of consular offices, which has been fixed at twenty per cent. of the salary, but this sum is spent under the direction of the Department of State, and can be used only for the renting of offices, strictly so speaking, and cannot be applied to the rental of their own house or lodgings. A clerk is allowed in some cases, and sometimes also a messenger where there seems to be an absolute need of such; but the appropriations made by Congress for clerk hire and for contingent expenses of consuls for many years past have been so grossly inadequate to the needs of the service that in most posts the offices are miserably equipped both as to clerks and messengers.

There are certain emoluments coming to consuls at certain posts of an unofficial nature, such as fees for taking depositions, oaths, etc., which are not considered official in their nature, and which a consular officer is therefore allowed to retain as his private property. All official fees—and these are prescribed by the President—every consular officer receiving a salary is bound to account for and to turn over to the Treasury of the United States. The unofficial fees in some places amount to large sums, and in London, Liverpool, Paris, and a few others of the important business centres, render the office of unusual value. In London, for instance, the unofficial fees amount to five or six times the prescribed salary. But the places where such large

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fees are to be secured are very few indeed, and might almost be said to be covered by the three places above named. By an odd perversion of justice, the receipts from unofficial fees are largest in the places where the largest salaries are paid.

It is not difficult to picture the plight of the man who finds himself, for example, in Ceylon, Auckland, or Cape Town, or, not quite so bad, but bad enough, in Malta, or Santos, or Para, all of which are places where the salaries are fixed at $1,500, with no financial resources except his salary. What must be the desperate financial embarrassment of the consul to either of these places who starts off for his post with the month's pay allowed him for what is called his instruction period and with no opportunity even to draw in advance that portion of his pay allowed him for his transit period, which can only be paid after he has rendered his accounts upon his arrival at the post, and with the remainder of his $1,500 to keep him for the rest of the year? It is not to be wondered at that some of our consular officers get into financial difficulties and leave their offices at the expiration of their terms, with debts unpaid. It is rather a matter of surprise that they manage as well as they appear to do. It may not, to be sure, cost a great deal for a man to live at Ceylon or Cape Town, when once he manages to reach those places; but even if that be a fact, he must live away from his family and in a most meager manner to eke out existence upon the present allowance. So too in Europe, in such places as Liege, and Copenhagen, and Nice, and many others where the salary is $1,500 and the unofficial work yields hardly any return.

These are only a few of the most glaring cases, but the position of a man without property of his own sufficient to make him practically independent of his salary so far as subsistence is concerned who goes for instance to Trieste, Cologne, Dublin, or Leeds, or to Sydney, New South Wales, or to Guatemala, or Managua, or to Tamatave, Madagascar, or to Odessa, or Manila, or Beirut, or Jerusalem, on a salary of $2,000 is relatively little better off. Nor is the position of a consul at Buenos Ayres, or at Brussels, or at Marseilles, Hamburg, Sheffield, Nuevo Laredo, Athens, Ningpo, or Victoria, B. C., with a salary of $2,500 to be envied, with the necessary demands which he is obliged to meet.

It is of course notorious that there are many more applicants for even the worst of these offices than there are offices, and that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

numberless men will be readily found to sacrifice themselves for the good of their country and go to Tamatave or Sydney on $2,000, or to Tahiti or Sierra Leone on $1,000. But the interest of the citizens of the United States is presumably centred more upon the welfare of the public service than on furnishing places for self-sacrificing individuals. They take no satisfaction in the creation of a consular office unless its existence is for the efficiency of the service as organized for their benefit. If such conditions are annexed to its creation as to militate against its effectiveness to accomplish the purpose for which it is created, the reason for its creation ceases to exist. That reason is primarily that the consular officer may encourage the increase of trade between his country and the country to which he is accredited by giving assistance in the way of information and protection to his fellow-citizens. In order to do this effectively he must be a man whose character inspires respect among the people with whom he associates and who has influence through his character, abilities, and position, not only as an officer, but also as a man among the people with whom he is to transact the business of his office. If the pecuniary allowance given him by his government is such as to render it impossible for him to live on an equality with his colleagues, or to maintain a social position in the community such as they are able to maintain, his government is the loser. It is far better to have no consular office in any given place than to cripple its efficiency by the conditions of its creation.

Unless Congress can see its way to make more generous appropriations for the consular service with a view principally to creating larger salaries, it would be far wiser to reduce the number of salaried offices and to distribute the sum of money now appropriated for the pay of two hundred and thirty-seven officers among one-half that number with salaries proportionately greater. In any case there should be no unsalaried officers whatever and no salary below twenty-five hundred dollars. There are now, as we have seen, besides the subordinate agencies which we have suggested should be abolished; about ninety-three unsalaried principal officers who receive their compensation in fees. These offices should either be abolished or should be made salaried offices and the fees received by them turned into the treasury.

In several countries the United States maintains a far greater number of consular offices than is required by the demands of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commerce and one which seems, moreover, disproportionate to the number maintained by these countries respectively in this country. For instance, in Germany we have fifty-one consular officers, while Germany has twenty-two in this country. In France the United States has thirty-seven, and France has twenty-five in this country. In the islands of Great Britain alone the United States has fifty-seven, in British North America about one-hundred and thirty, besides others scattered over the world in other possessions of the British Empire. Great Britain has, in all, forty-two consular offices in this country. A great reduction in the number of United States consular officers could most advantageously be made in Canada, especially in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. It is not going too far to state that two-thirds of the offices in these provinces could be discontinued with the best results for the interests of the service.

If the prizes are larger, the competitors will be of superior quality. The best men will not compete for an inferior prize, and in order to induce such men as should be in the consular service te enter it as a life career, there should be assured to them as long as they remain in it at least a livelihood approximate to that which they would have secured if they had remained in the ordinary walks of life. It is in no way in conflict with the spirit of our institutions that a man who has once been proved competent for a branch of the government service should remain in it as long as he behaves himself, or, if the duties which he performs therein are worthy of performance, that the pay should be sufficient to support him. Tenure of office during good behavior, in the sense above indicated, and adequate compensation, would free the service from some of its existing evils and threatened dangers, and, whether effected in the manner here suggested or however otherwise accomplished, are necessary elements in its reformation. And they should go together, for the reason that each one is dependent upon the other for the good that it can work.

WILLIAM F. WHARTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE REPUBLICAN OUTLOOK.

BY THE HON. THOMAS H. CARTER, CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

SINCE its organization, the best interests and the purest aspirations of the people have found representation and expression through the Republican party. As a rule the prospects of the party have not been brighter than the prospects of the country, and the present exception proves that the prosperity the nation has enjoyed found its fostering force in the pre-eminent adaptability of Republican principles and policies to the moral, social, physical, and economic conditions of our national life.

For well nigh a generation prior to March 4, 1893, the people of the United States had enjoyed an almost unvarying experience of prosperity, unparalleled in the world's history. Preliminary to an intelligent forecast of the prospects of the party, an estimate of the extent, and a brief analysis of the causes, of its defeat in 1892, seem essential. After successfully conducting the government through the war for the preservation of the Union, the party addressed itself to the task of vitalizing and developing the industrial energies of the country. The protective tariff policy which had sustained the government through the perils of the rebellion was adopted as a cardinal principle of Republican faith, and was advocated as a governmental policy calculated to secure the permanent commercial and industrial independence of the nation, and the highest attainable prosperity for the body of the people.

With a view to facilitating the settlement of the western country, and to more closely binding together remote parts of the Union, railway construction across the plains and through the mountains was encouraged. Inspired by enlightened progressive public policy, the men who had conquered the rebellion set about

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the task of converting the material resources of the continent to the purposes of civilization. The wonderful achievements of this conquest of peace outstripped the most marvellous tales of Oriental fiction and challenged the admiration of all mankind. Contrasted with the gloomy periods of Democratic rule before the war, the new era brought into bold relief the merits of progressive as opposed to reactionary policy.

In the mean time the great tide of immigration following the war carried with it certain vicious elements which naturally lodged in the large cities of the country, and quite as naturally gravitated to and remained steadily with the Democratic party. In the wards of all our large cities where crime, ignorance, and alien sentiments prevail, Democratic majorities are unfailing and overwhelming.

For the party, the extraordinary success of the country brought forth elements of weakness. The minority persistently contended that the experience of the past could not be justly applied to present conditions; that the achievements of science and art had so far modified industrial affairs that ancient rules relating to supply and demand, social development, educational advancement, and the general conditions incident to and surrounding this republic no longer controlled, as formerly, our internal and external relations.

Gradually sentiment became eliminated from national politics the farther we receded from the great war period, and the issue that gave rise to it. In a constantly increasing degree, political convictions evolved from mathematical calculations, and on this cold basis party enthusiasm was chilled.

Individual prosperity began to be regarded only in a relative sense. The laborer whose daily wage was greater, both nominally and in purchasing power, than the sum earned in like employment in any other country, became dissatisfied because his employer seemed more prosperous than himself. The rapid transposition of various forms of real estate into personal property, through the formation of incorporated companies created to facilitate large railway and other operations, naturally resulted in building up large fortunes, which experience has shown more apparent than real in thousands of instances. Nevertheless these large apparent accumulations of wealth sufficed to breed envy and discontent among prosperous people whose situations, while felici-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tous in themselves, became unsatisfactory because suffering by comparison.

Thus enterprises fostered by the Republican party, actuated by a desire to guarantee the perpetuity of the Union, or to meet the quickened and progressive spirit of the age, developed elements of discontent to the party's disadvantage. From these and other causes the percentage of Republican votes gradually decreased in the Republican States after the war.

The platform in 1872 declared emphatically in favor of a protective tariff. The Democratic platform avoided the issue by referring the question to the people of the Congressional districts. It is a significant fact that in the election of that year the Republican party polled the largest percentage of the popular vote ever cast for its presidential candidate, viz., 55.63 per cent., whereas in 1864, eleven Democratic States not voting, Lincoln only received 55.06 per cent. of the popular vote.

While temporary causes have induced the percentage to rise and fall since 1872, the fact is apparent that the percentage of the total vote cast for Republican candidates in presidental elections has decreased as the following table will show:

Year.	Rep. Per Cent. of Pop. Vote.	Year.	Rep. Per Cent. of Pop. Vote.
1872	55.63	1884	48.22
1876	47.95	1888	47.83
1880	48.31	1892	42.84

It is important to bear in mind that a very large proportion of the Republican vote cast in the Southern States in 1872 was thereafter so suppressed that to-day it is voiceless and unheard. To assume that Republican loss has resulted in corresponding Democratic gains would be erroneous, as the following table of Democratic percentages of the total vote will show:

Year.	Dem. Per Cent. of Pop. Vote.	Year.	Dem. Per Cent. of Pop. Vote.
1872	43.83	1884	48.48
1876	50.94	1888	48.63
1880	48.20	1892	45.98

The balance of the popular vote has been cast for the presidential candidates of independent parties that have changed names and professions at each election.

It will be observed that Mr. Cleveland received a smaller percentage of the popular vote in 1892 than had been cast for any candidate of his party since 1872. Democratic success in 1892

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

did not therefore result, as has been popularly supposed, from a general uprising in favor of that party or its theories of government, but on the contrary the popular verdict was adverse to Mr. Cleveland, free trade, and reaction.

The third, or People's, party, supplemented by the sectarian-school-law agitation in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Indiana, is responsible for Mr. Cleveland's election and is entitled to whatever credit or blame there may be attached to his administration. Through the causes indicated, the Republican States of Wisconsin, Illinois, California, North Dakota, Indiana, and Ohio cast 61 electoral votes for Mr. Cleveland, and the States of Kansas, Colorado, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, and Idaho cast 22 votes for Weaver. These votes, placed in the Republican column, where they legitimately belong, would have resulted in 228 electoral votes for Harrison, as against 194 for Cleveland, with New York in the Democratic column.

Again, it will be observed by reference to the returns that a change of 27,426 votes, properly distributed in California, Delaware, Idaho, North Dakota, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, and West Virginia, would have given those States to Harrison and secured his election.

Elections in the Southern States have confessedly become such a mere matter of form that little significance can justly be attached to the returns as indicative of public sentiment, and therefore the increase or decrease of majorities in only those States wherein elections are substantially fair and free can be referred to as conveying instructive lessons. In the country north of Mason and Dixon's line and west of the old slave territory, notwithstanding the People's party movement, Harrison in 1892 fell only 148,276 behind his vote of 1888; whereas Cleveland, the legatee of all disaffections and disorders in the same territory, received in 1892 72,431 votes less than in 1888.

It is obvious from a glance at these facts and figures that through all party vicissitudes for thirty years the Republican party has maintained its hold on a large percentage of the popular vote with a tenacity unprecedented in party history in this country. It is also obvious that in 1892 the party principles were not repudiated directly by the people, nor did the popular verdict direct, although it permitted, a substitution of the Democratic theory of free trade for the Republican policy of protection.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Independently of the existing financial, commercial, and industrial depression, the future of the Republican party is unquestionably bright and promising.

The experience being endured by the country now will inevitably and indelibly impress upon this generation a clear understanding of the potential influence of a governmental policy, not only upon the nation at large, but likewise upon the vital interests of the individual citizen. Practical experience is clearing up erroneous impressions.

In 1888 the people directed a revision of the tariff by the friends of the protective policy, at the same time repudiating the revision presented on free-trade lines by the so-called Mills bill. As a matter of fact, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives prepared, and Congress passed, in what is known as the McKinley Act, a revenue bill substantially in conformity with the demands of the electors. But it so happened in the framing of its schedules in committee, and in running the gauntlet through the House with its slender majority, together with certain amendments made in the Senate, duties were increased here and there upon a sufficient number of articles in general use to enable the minority to successfully prosecute, in the brief time between the passage of the bill and the elections of 1890, a campaign distinguished by the most colossal misrepresentation ever invented with intent to bewilder and mislead the people. Few had read the bill, and the country had not become familiar with its operations. The astute commercial instinct of many of our merchants, intent on stimulating trade, multiplied the apostles of error. Every one was advised to buy quickly and heavily, because of the alleged inevitable increase of prices under the McKinley law, and as a matter of fact prices were temporarily advanced in many instances on goods not affected by the tariff, and in other cases on articles that had actually been placed on the free list.

While in truth the McKinley Act made greater reductions than the Mills bill proposed, the impression became general, and existed until after the election of 1892, that the McKinley Act had greatly and unnecessarily increased the tariff. Laboring under this impression, people felt that the Republican party had abused its authority, and, so believing, they defeated us overwhelmingly at the polls in 1890. Before the election of 1892

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many of these popular errors had been exploded by actual demonstration. More men had been employed, at better wages, than under any previous revenue law. Mills and factories were working on full time, and in some instances on double time. Prosperity reigned supreme. Confidence was universal throughout the land. Even the opponents of the Harrison administration felt constrained to admit that the Federal Government had never been administered with greater purity, intelligence, and dignity.

The extraordinary prosperity of the country generated widespread unrest amongst the great body of our laboring people. Extravagant though the statement may seem, I think it is nevertheless true, that great prosperity is quite as prolific a source of discontent and unrest as corresponding adversity. Old experience had ceased to be instructive. A certain percentage of the labor element accepted the statement that the manufacturers alone profited by the tariff, and that labor organizations did and would continue to maintain the price of wages irrespective of tariff schedules. But even in the presence of these conditions Mr. Cleveland wisely discerned that he could not hope to succeed on the Chicago platform and therefore in his letter of acceptance virtually repudiated the tariff plank of his party platform in the following words :

"The protection of the people in the exclusive use and enjoyment of their property and earnings concededly constitutes the special purpose and mission of our free government. This design is so interwoven with the structure of our plan of rule that failure to protect the citizen in such use and enjoyment, or their unjustifiable diminution by the government itself, is a betrayal of the people's trust. . . . We wage no exterminating war against any American interests."

On the vital issue of the campaign the great mass of the voters who supported Cleveland and Stevenson undoubtedly did so, as the recent Ohio election bears witness, accepting the tariff views expressed by Mr. Cleveland, and not the sentiments of the Chicago platform.

It is worthy of note that the language employed by Mr. Cleveland above quoted is almost identical in tone with the expressions in the letter of Mr. Polk in 1844, as follows:

"In adjusting the details of a revenue tariff I have heretofore sanctioned such moderate discriminating duties as would produce the amount of revenue needed and at the same time afford reasonable incidental protection to our home industry."

Mr. Polk was elected, as was Mr. Cleveland. The free-trade

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tariff bill of 1846 was in no sense less the consummation of a deception than will the Wilson bill prove an imposition if approved as passed by the House. Southern Democrats, led by Robert J. Walker, of Mississippi, President Polk's Secretary of the Treasury, prepared the free-trade bill of 1846; and the same element, headed by Mr. Carlisle, of Kentucky, now Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Wilson, of West Virginia, has dominated the present Congress, which has presented to the country the Wilson bill.

The tariff of 1846 quickly destroyed the prosperity attained under the protective tariff of 1842, precisely as the shadow and threat of the Wilson bill have quickly withered and blighted the magnificent prosperity attained under the tariff of 1890. History is but repeating itself. The good old ante-bellum days are with us again. These days are being endured, not enjoyed.

Taking into account the exhausted surplus supplies in the homes and retail stores of the country, it is not improbable that the fixing of definite figures by the passage of the Wilson bill will induce temporary business activity, but it is not necessary that existing stagnation continue, to insure Republican success. The American people must do some business on any basis. The party can and will succeed in 1896.

The question is frequently asked, Will the Western Republican States that supported the Weaver-Cleveland tickets at the last presidential election return to their allegiance? It would seem to suffice in answer to the question to refer to the scandalous administration of public affairs by representatives of the People's party in Western States and the consequent disintegration of the party as evidenced by the elections of 1893 in the States affected. The Populists have been a greater injury and affliction to Kansas than the grasshoppers and dry winds; while the good people of the neighboring State of Colorado have suffered in credit and self-respect through their connection with the same organization.

The People's party is a free-trade party, whereas the sentiment of the Western States is decidedly in favor of protection. While for vote-catching purposes the People's party pronounced in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, current events are driving the people to understand that as far as it has any financial theories, it favors cheap money, whereas the loyal advocates of silver coinage are opposed to cheap paper money, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are in favor of bimetallism or a currency based on both gold and silver. All thoughtful men throughout the silver-producing States are beginning to fully realize that those States cannot achieve desired results by allowing the silver question to be handled by a party destined to be eternally in a minority.

The People's party is a Southern exotic, and on its financial theories responds to the Southern demand for fiat money and plenty of it; our Western people are as firmly devoted to sound money as the people of any part of the country. They are ardent bimetallists, and their interest in the restoration of silver is, of course, intensified by the fact that they produce it. Place-hunting demagogues have played upon this intense feeling by making extravagant statements which have constantly tended to create an erroneous impression throughout the Eastern States. A better understanding is destined to be reached between Eastern and Western Republicans. The people of the West are beginning to realize that through prudent, rather than extravagant, counsel their interests may be best subserved.

The fact is being considered that at least 90 per cent. of the people of the whole country are in favor of bimetallism and of the use of both gold and silver as the metals, and that the difference of opinion between the East and West arises, not on the principle involved, but upon the methods that can be safely employed to bring about the desired result. It is clear that nothing can be expected from the Democratic party, which is in power and will not do anything, nor from the People's party, which is neither in power nor justified in hoping for success. To the Republican party, the people will turn with renewed confidence and the Western Republican States will prove in future as loyal as of old.

All other considerations aside, should history remain true to itself, the present financial, commercial, and industrial depression precludes the possibility of Democratic success in 1896, and insures Republican triumph.

The panic of 1837 resulted in the overthrow of the Democratic party in 1840. The panic of 1857, while commonly lost sight of as a political force because of the stirring events which preceded the rebellion, rendered Republican success possible in 1860. The financial disturbances of 1873 reduced Republican strength from 55.63 per cent. to 47.95 per cent. of the total popular vote in 1876,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the depression of 1883 prepared the way for Republican defeat in 1884. With a difference of only 3.14 per cent. of the popular vote in favor of the Democratic party, it will be perceived that a change of less than two votes in every hundred will insure success in the Republican States that have wandered from their party allegiance.

Existing conditions seem to guarantee a more radical change in the popular vote than Republican necessities require.

The trend of public sentiment is very clearly disclosed by the returns of recent elections in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Iowa, Kansas, and elsewhere, all showing phenomenally large Republican gains.

In conclusion, then, Republican loss in the past has resulted from the abatement of party enthusiasm through the elimination of sentiment, personal disappointments resulting from the friction incident to a long-continued administration, discontent and unrest born of extraordinary prosperity, a misunderstanding between Eastern and Western Republicans as to the safe and effective method to be employed for the restoration of bimetallism, the suppression by force of the Republican vote in the South, the cohesiveness and ever-increasing strength of the vicious elements in the large cities, and a misunderstanding as to the real character of the McKinley law.

The great work to be done in the future for the advancement of civilization and good government in this country insures the perpetuation of Republican supremacy. It is the only national party in the United States worthy of the name and entirely equal to the intelligent administration of the general government. In the arena of peaceful conquest its great mission has scarcely begun. It remains for the party in the future to place our tariff system on a permanent basis along protection lines, and to develop the American merchant marine until our flag shall float over our messengers of commerce in every harbor and over all the seas.

The Monroe Doctrine must be rescued from the domain of sentiment and be recognized as a living, vital, and inviolable principle, supported by the strong arm of the government.

The two oceans must be united by the Nicaragua Canal.

The perpetuity of our republican form of government must be guaranteed by insuring honest national elections.

The men who saved the Republic must enjoy respectful consideration in their old age.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The claim of men to superiority over the material things created by their labor must be maintained.

The principle that the nation is greater than any of its component parts must not be surrendered.

Our foreign policy must become a strong American foreign policy—so firmly established and vigorously maintained that all the nations of the earth will extend to us the respect and consideration due to the strength we have attained and the high order of civilization we have reached.

Bimetallism must be restored on a safe and permanent basis.

The great work of internal improvements must be continued.

To these and kindred questions the Republican party will be commissioned anew to address itself at the next general election. The present unfortunate experience cannot fail to impress the country with the gravity of the mistake made in 1892, whereby the progressive work of the party was suddenly interrupted.

With a manifest misinterpretation of public sentiment presented through the Wilson bill; with current history verifying to an unfortunate degree all predictions made by the most ardent protectionist with reference to the destructive evils to follow the abandonment of the protective policy; with closed factories and open soup-houses, with disorganized business and organized charity; with breadless homes in the midst of the world's greatest granary; with the increase of the flocks of Australia and of South America simultaneously with the disappearance of the flocks from our own pastures; with New England idle and Old England active; with assignees and receivers as prominent business factors throughout the land; with organized labor seeking, not *higher* wages, but *any* wages; with decreased exports and increased imports; with cheap things and no chance to earn a dollar to buy them; with idle miners and flooded mines; with increasing farm products thrown into decreasing markets; with our foreign policy reversed, to the humiliation of the nation; and with confidence and hope supplanted by doubt and uncertainty—who can question that the contrast of *worse* with *better* days will result in the overwhelming triumph in 1896 of the party of progress, patriotism, and prosperity?

THOMAS H. CARTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR NAVIGATION LAWS.

BY CHARLES H. CRAMP.

WHEN one traces the history of the navigation laws of the United States, beginning with the act of December 31, 1792, which closed American registry to foreign-built vessels except as to prizes taken in war, down to the present time, there appears cumulative evidence that the policy had its origin in the spirit of national independence, commercial as well as political. Superficial students and shallow reasoners associate our navigation laws with the doctrine of protection, as embodied in our tariff system. But in point of fact, there is no association between them.

The object of the Revolutionary fathers in enacting the prohibitive navigation law of 1792 was to provide for the development and perpetuity of shipbuilding in the United States as an indispensable condition of commercial independence and as an unfailing nursery of naval strength. At that time there was no need of protection to American shipbuilding, in the tariff sense of the term.

The *Pennsylvania Packet*, in its issue of May 7, 1790, contained the following review of the then comparative state of shipbuilding in America and Europe, from the financial point of view:

"Shipbuilding is an art for which the United States are peculiarly qualified by their skill in the construction and by the materials with which their country abounds. . . .

"They build oak vessels on lower terms than the cheapest European vessels of fir, pine, and larch. The cost of a white-oak ship in New England is about 24 Mexican dollars per ton, fitted for sea; a fir vessel costs in the ports of the Baltic 35 Mexican dollars per ton; though the American oak ship is much safer and more durable. The maximum cost of a vessel of the highest class of American live oak and cedar, which with salted timbers will last 30 years without repair, is only 36 to 38 dollars per ton in our different ports; while an oak ship, fitted in a similar manner, in the cheapest ports of England, Holland, or France, will cost 55 to 60 dollars per ton."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This relative state of the first cost of ships existed at the date of the passage of the prohibitory law in 1792. Hence, it could not have been a merely protective measure, in the tariff sense, because under the conditions stated by the *Pennsylvania Packet* there could have been no competition.

The policy of the fathers had a broader basis, a deeper foundation, and a wider scope of patriotism and foresight. They realized that American-built ships were not only less costly, but better and more efficient vehicles of commerce than contemporary foreign ships. They knew that, at the then prevailing rates of cost, it would be impossible for any American merchant to import a newly built foreign ship. Therefore, the immediate object of their law of 1792 could not have been else than to prohibit the purchase and registry of old and partly worn-out foreign ships, and thereby to maintain in our merchant marine the high standard of superiority due to the greater skill of American builders, and the better grade of American materials. But this was not their only purpose. With foresight amounting to prophecy they seemed to divine the vicissitudes of the future. So, at the very beginning of the federal government they laid this navigation law of 1792 as one of the foundation-stones of our domestic polity for all time, and wholly indifferent to mere economic conditions of the day in which they lived.

During the one hundred and one years that have elapsed since George Washington approved the navigation law, the conditions of shipbuilding in America, relatively to those prevailing abroad, have undergone many vicissitudes. At any time between 1790 and 1840 the conditions set forth in the review quoted from the *Pennsylvania Packet* prevailed, and the United States continued to enjoy the advantage of her natural resources and the superior skill of her naval architects and shipwrights. But, as England's supply of timber vanished, her production of metals increased, which fact naturally caused the evolution of the iron ship.

The practicability of the use of iron in ship construction had been seen long before it became a commercial fact, but while the system was early known, the development of proper structural devices was of slower progress. As early as 1823 Captain De Montgery, of the French Navy, published a valuable work entitled *Memoire sur les Navires en Fer*, in the form of papers in the *An-*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nales de l'Industrie Nationale et Étrangère, which were subsequently reprinted in a small book in 1824. Captain Montgery introduced his work with the remark that "one might, perhaps, trace the origin of iron vessels to an invention of Demetrius Poliorcetes when he was besieging Rhodes, 304 years before the present era."

After some other interesting historical researches, Captain Montgery pointed out that the chief obstacle to successful shipbuilding in iron at that time (1823–24) was due to the lack of suitable machinery for working and shaping the material. This, he said, could not be done by hand as in the case of wooden ships, and he left the matter of inventing or adapting the necessary mechanical appliances for metal construction to the skill of practical shipbuilders.

These achievements came along quite slowly during the twenty years immediately following Captain Montgery's suggestion. The capacity of plate and shape mills was limited to small sizes and light weights. Punching, bending, and other ship-shed appliances were crude and costly. The old woodworking shipwrights did not at first take kindly to the new material. In fact the first iron hulls were built by boilermakers, on plans prepared by the wood-ship builders.

In this country the development of the iron industry was much slower than in England during the period under consideration, so that, by the time the actual supremacy of the iron ship became established, we were far behind that country in all the essentials for rapid and economical construction. This state of things turned the tables as to first cost, besides relegating the wooden ship to the past. As soon as the English found that they could build iron ships cheaper than we could, and that their iron ships were commercially superior to our wooden ones, they at once began to clamor for repeal of our navigation laws. They rapidly pushed their way into the markets of the rest of the world, building iron ships at great profit to themselves for nearly every nation but our own, and they naturally desired to overrun ours too.

Then began a series of systematic, organized assaults on our navigation laws, always prompted from English sources and gradually adopted as a policy by certain of our lawmakers. These assaults, though made with vigor and sometimes adroitly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

managed, failed in every case. Whenever the question came to a vote it was always found that a majority in one or both houses of Congress had inherited the patriotism of their ancestors of 1792.

Had any of these assaults been successful to the extent of wiping the act of 1792 from the pages of the Revised Statutes, there would not now be a first-class shipyard in existence on our soil and we would have been, like Chili and Japan, forced to dicker on the banks of the Clyde for the construction of our new navy, if we had one at all. But aside from the desire of English shipbuilders to create a new market for their product by opening our registry, there is a political cause operating with even greater force to make free American registry a desideratum to England. It lies in the threat of maritime war to which European nations are constantly exposed and which just now happens to be at an acute stage.

At the time of the Franco-German war of 1870-71, even so sturdy a patriot as General Grant, then President, was persuaded for a time that it would be a good thing for our commerce as a neutral nation to permit American registry of foreign-built vessels, the theory being that many vessels of nations which might become involved in the struggle would seek the asylum of our flag.

Actuated by powerful New York influences which found expression through Roscoe Conkling, Edwin D. Morgan, and Hamilton Fish, already conspicuously hostile to the American merchant marine, General Grant in a special message recommended that Congress enact legislation to that end. This proposition was antagonized by Judge Kelley, of Pennsylvania—always at the front when American interests were threatened—in one of his most powerful efforts, couched in the vehement eloquence of which he was master, which impressed General Grant so much that he abandoned that policy, and subsequently adhered to the existing system.

I will not stop here to point out in detail the tremendous political and diplomatic advantage which England would enjoy when dealing with other maritime powers if she could have always at hand an asylum for the lame ducks of her commercial fleet in time of war. Her ocean greyhounds that could either escape the enemy's cruisers, or be readily converted into cruisers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves, might remain under her flag; while all her slow freighters, tramps, and obsolete passenger boats of past eras would be transferred by sham sales to our flag, under which they could pursue their traffic in safety during the war under peace rates of insurance, and without any material diversion of their earnings, which would of course be increased by war freight rates, returning to their former allegiance at the end of the war. The lack of such an asylum amounts to a perpetual bond to keep the peace.

From the end of the civil war to about 1880, there was but feeble effort to revive shipbuilding in this country. All our energies of capital and enterprise, as I have remarked elsewhere, were directed to the extension of railways in every direction, to the repair of the war-ravages in the South, to the settlement of the vast territories of the West—in a word, to purely domestic development; pending which, England was by common consent left to enjoy her ocean monopoly.

Such was the state of affairs in 1883–85, when the adoption of the policy of naval reconstruction offered to American shipbuilding the first encouragement it had seen in a quarter of a century.

When we began to build the new navy, every English journal, from the London *Times* down pooh-poohed the idea that a modern man-of-war could be built in an American yard, modern high-powered engines in an American machine shop, or modern breech-loading cannon in an American forge. Many of the English shipbuilders rubbed their hands in actual anticipation of orders from this government for the ships and guns we needed, and they blandly assured us that they would give us quite as favorable terms as were accorded to China, Japan, and Chili. And, to their shame be it said, there were officers of our navy who not only adopted this view, but did all they could to commit our government to the pernicious policy.

In 1885, when Secretary Whitney took control of the Navy Department, the efforts of English shipbuilders to secure at least a share of the work were renewed. By this time the English were willing to admit that the hulls of modern ships could be built in the United States; but they were satisfied that our best policy would be to buy the necessary engines, cannon, and armor from them. Secretary Whitney, however, promptly decided that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the only article of foreign production which the new navy needed was the plans of vessels for comparison. This was wise, because it placed in the hands of our builders the results of the most mature experience abroad, at comparatively small cost. But one of the earliest and firmest decisions of Mr. Whitney was that our naval vessels, machinery and all, must be built at home and of domestic material.

The efforts of the English builders to get the engine-work for our new navy were much more serious and formidable than is generally known. A prominent member of the House Committee on Naval Affairs proposed an amendment to a pending naval bill empowering the Secretary at his discretion to contract abroad for the construction of propelling machinery for our naval ships. The language was, of course, general, but every one knows that the term "abroad" in this sense would be synonymous with Great Britain, and nothing more.

Mr. Whitney promptly met this proposition with a protest in the shape of a letter to the Naval Committee dated February 27, 1886. He said that so far as he was concerned, he would not avail himself of such a power if granted. There was no occasion for such power, and it could have no effect except to keep American builders in suspense and thereby augment the difficulty of obtaining capital for the enlargement of their facilities to meet the national requirements. Mr. Whitney's protest was so vigorous that the proposition died from its effects in the committee, and has been well-nigh forgotten. The proposer himself became satisfied that he had been misled by the representations of naval officers who were under English influence, and did not press his amendment.

I have brought these facts forward for the purpose of emphasizing my declaration that the promotive influence behind every movement against our navigation laws is of British origin, and that whenever you put a pin through a free-ship bill you prick an Englishman.

The portion of Mr. Whitney's letter referring to the proposed free-engine clause in the Naval Bill of 1886 was as follows:

> I think our true policy is to borrow the ideas of our neighbors as far as they are thought to be in advance of ours, give them to our shipbuilders in the shape of plans; and, having this object in view, I have been anxious to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acquire detailed drawings of the latest machinery in use abroad, and should feel at liberty to spend more in the same way in getting hold of the latest things as far as possible for the purpose of utilizing them. We have made important accumulations in this line during the last six months. I think I ought to say to the committee that I have placed myself in communication with some of the principal marine-engine builders of the country within the last three months for the purpose of conferring with them upon this subject. I detailed two officers of the navy—a chief engineer and a line officer—who, under my directions, visited the principal establishments in the East. They recognize that in the matter of engines for naval ships we are quite inexperienced as compared with some other countries. It is this fact, doubtless, which the committee has in view in authorizing the purchase and importation of engines for one of the vessels authorized to be constructed under this act. If the committee will permit me to make the suggestion, I find myself quite satisfied, after consultation with people engaged in the industry in this country, that it would not be necessary for me to avail of that discretionary power in order to produce machines of the most advanced character. Our marine-engine builders in general express their inability at the present moment to design the latest and most approved type of engines for naval vessels—an inability arising from the fact that they have not been called upon to do anything of importance in that line. At the same time, they state that if they are given the necessary time, and are asked to offer designs in competition, they would acquaint themselves with the state of the art abroad and here, and would prepare to offer to the government designs embodying the latest improvements in the art. And they are ready to construct at the present time anything that can be built anywhere else if the plans are furnished. As I find no great difficulty in the way of purchasing plans (in fact there is an entire readiness to sell to us on the part of the engine builders abroad) I think the solution of the question will be not very difficult, although it may require some time and a little delay.

It will be noted that but little more than eight years have elapsed since the date of Secretary Whitney's letter. The wisdom of his policy needs no eulogy, beyond the history of the development of steam engineering in the United States during that brief period. In fact no other eulogy could be a tenth part as eloquent as that history is.

In 1886 we were content to purchase engine plans abroad. In 1894 we exhibit to the world the marvellous machinery of the New York, the Olympia, and the Columbia ; not to speak of the still higher development that is now being wrought out for the new greyhounds of the American trans-Atlantic line.

The engines of the New York, Olympia, and Columbia have no equals, either in material, workmanship, or performance. Does any one suppose they would have ever been built if Secretary Whitney had adopted the policy of buying our naval engines in England, thereby devoting the resources of the American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treasury to promote a British monopoly? No. In their stead we would have, perhaps, the engines of the Blake, guaranteed to develop 20,000 indicated horse power, and accepted on a performance of 13,000; or the engines of the Vulcan, with deficiency of performance even more pitiable.

The policy of Secretary Whitney was in fact an echo of the sturdy patriotism that framed the act of December 31, 1792, dictated by the same impulse of national independence and conceived in the same aspiration of patriotic pride.

And now, in the face of this record so fresh and recent, the same old demand for English free ships is heard again in our midst, promoted by the same old lobby and pressed on the same old lines. Are we never to hear the last of it? Is there to be a perennial supply of American legislators willing to promote a British industry by destroying an American one? To all history, to all logic, they oppose a single phrase: "Let us buy ships where they are cheapest." Well, if national independence is valueless, and if everything is to be subordinated to cheapness, why not get our laws made in the House of Commons? The members of the House of Commons legislate for nothing. Senators and Representatives charge $5,000 a year for their services, besides stationery allowance and mileage. The House of Commons makes laws cheaper than our Congress does. Our ships and our capacity to create them are as much a symbol of independence as our laws are; and if it is good policy to get the former where they are cheapest, why not get the latter on the same terms?

Two years ago I discussed in these pages "The First Cost of Ships," pointing out, among other things, the enormous progress that has been made in the development of ships and engine building and contributory industries in a brief space by reason of the reconstruction of the navy under a domestic policy. Last November I contributed a paper to the "Proceedings of the American Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers," in which I stated that, notwithstanding the privilege embodied in Section 8 of the existing tariff to import material of foreign production free of duty for use in the construction of vessels designed for the foreign trade, I had not taken advantage of it, but had placed orders for many thousand tons of steel with American rolling mills, forges, and foundries.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I had to pay something more for American material than British material would have cost delivered here, but there were certain mechanical and financial considerations involved which in my judgment more than offset this disparity. Hence we may dismiss the question of material and consider only that of labor, which represents a very large percentage of the cost of a ship.

In this particular the English builders have an undoubted advantage over us, as will appear from the subjoined tables of comparative wages embracing twenty occupations. I have not depended on the consular reports, but have compiled them through my own sources of information from the actual payrolls respectively of British ship-yards and our own. In reducing British wages to our standard I have taken the shilling as the equivalent of our quarter of a dollar. I have also brought all wages to a weekly basis, taking the average yearly rate of fifty-six hours to the week in the British yards:

Trade.	British Rate.	American Rate.	Trade.	British Rate.	American Rate.
Patternmakers	$9.00	$18.00	Shipshed machine men	$7.20	$15.00
Machinists	8.50	15.00	Furnacemen	6.00	10.80
Riveters	7.50	12.00	Riggers	7.20	11.00
Calkers and chippers	7.80	15.00	Plumbers	9.60	19.50
Beam and angle smiths	8.40	15.00	Drillers	6.40	11.00
Holders-on	4.20	9.00	Sheetiron workers	8.50	15.00
Fitters-up	7.80	15.00	Coppersmiths	8.60	18.00
Ship carpenters	9.60	18.00	Moulders, iron	9.00	14.50
Joiners	9.00	16.50	Moulders, brass	9 00	15.00
Painters	9.60	18.00	Laborers	4.20	$8 to $9

These figures are taken direct from the books of representative shipyards in the United States and Great Britain, and represent average rates for 1893. The comparison tells its own story. Brushing aside sophistry and cant, we have in front of us a plain proposition, the logic of which no man can evade. It is simply this:

A vote for English free ships means a vote to reduce the wages of American patternmakers from $18 a week to the British rate of $9; of American machinists from $15 a week to $8.50; of American boilermakers from $15 a week to $8.50; of American sheet-iron workers from $15 a week to $8.50; of American coppersmiths from $18 to $8.60; of American plumbers and pipe fitters from $19.50 per week to $9.60; of American carpenters from $18 a week to $9.60; of American drillers from $11 a week to $6.40; of American fitters-up from $15 a week to $7.80; of American riveters from $12 a week to $7.50; of American calkers from $15 a week to $7.80; of American moulders from $15 a week to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$9; of American furnacemen from $11 a week to $6; of American painters from $18 a week to $9.60; of American joiners from $16.50 a week to $9; of American common laborers from $9 a week to $4.20.

There is no alternative to these reductions of wages except total closing of American shipyards, which of course would reduce all shipbuilding wages from their present rates to nothing. This is what men mean when they talk about buying ships where they are cheapest. This is what makes ships cheaper in England than here. And this too is what makes English ships inferior to American ships, class for class and rate for rate; it is because $18 a week will buy better skill and greater diligence than $9 or $10 a week in any country or under any flag.

As a collateral argument in favor of free ships we are informed by the last report of the Post-Office Department that the act of March 3, 1891, providing for ocean mail service in American vessels has not resulted in any improvement of the merchant marine.

The solemnity with which this information is offered to the country indicates that its authors considered it important. Less than three years have elapsed since that law was enacted. Without reference to its merits as an economic policy, but from the practical point of view, not much progress could be expected in that time, unless merchant fleets are supposed to spring from the brain of Congress full panoplied like Minerva from the brow of Jove. However, a broader survey of the situation shows that there has been material improvement of the merchant marine consequent upon that act.

In conjunction with another act which created the nucleus of an American line of trans-Atlantic greyhounds, the law of March 3, 1891, has caused five new vessels to be under construction, which are in all respects abreast and in many respects ahead of anything now afloat. These vessels are being built in conformity to the requirements of the two acts referred to, under a contract duly executed between their owners and the Post-Office Department, to go into active effect in October, 1895, for a period of ten years. This is surely progress and improvement, but the Foreign Mail Bureau of the Post-Office Department has either overlooked or ignored it through impatience with the slow processes inevitable in the production of ships over a tenth of a mile long.

This is somewhat digressive, but it is introduced here by way

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of preface to the remark that the capacity to build such ships has been attained but recently by any American shipyard, and hence, unless active hostility to American shipbuilding be admitted as the motive, it is difficult to conceive the rationale of a movement the success of which would be inevitably and almost instantly fatal to the entire industry.

It has been well said that "A great steamship is the grandest triumph of mind over matter." In no other structure appears such a combination of science and skill, such a conspiracy of brain and brawn. When a steamship leaves the yard for her maiden voyage her cost account shows ninety-five per cent. of the total to the credit of labor. There is no charge for right of way, real estate, or accessories. She is a thing of life, an autonomy within herself, and, once off the land, is for the time being a planet. Her deck is the soil of the nation whose flag she bears. Her freight is not only the commodities of commerce, but human lives. Upon her safety and efficiency constantly hang the hopes and loves of thousands. No other thing made by human hands can appeal to the sentiment of men like a great steamship. From this point of view there is an element of public pride, of patriotic exultation in the national possession of great steamships, and it would seem that cognate pride and exultation ought to be cherished in the national capacity to create them. Such a capacity, after years of disheartening struggle against powerful and vindictive rivalry, has at last been attained and is now being exerted with grand results—when Congress is asked to paralyze it for all time.

It has been said that even if the English should build all our ships for us, except those for the coastwise trade under such a law, American shipyards would still flourish on the proceeds of the coastwise construction and the repairs. Did the authors of that theory ever see an establishment entirely devoted to the repair of ships that was equipped to build so much as a tug? The Erie Basin Drydocks in New York are exclusively repair works. Was ever a ship built there? Could one be built there? Certainly not.

As for the resources of the coastwise trade, the state of shipbuilding in this country ten years ago, and before the government came into the market with the new navy, indicates the limit of its possibilities. From 1878 to 1888 there was considerable activity in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shipbuilding for the coastwise trade, resulting in the production of a large amount of tonnage which newly equipped that traffic for a term of years. After 1888 this demand fell off in consequence of having been fully supplied, so that since that time but few orders for further coastwise construction have been offered. The total tonnage of new or comparatively new iron steam tonnage now employed in the coastwise trade, including colliers and ocean tugs employed in barge-towing, is about 340,000, and this, in the opinion of men qualified to judge, is a fair supply for the rest of this century at least.

It is observed that the present English raid on the navigation law is the most determined yet made. This is because the development of shipbuilding capacity in Great Britain during the last decade has outstripped the demand for ships, and there is desperate need of a new market.

France, Germany, Holland, Spain, Russia, and Italy, which were formerly large customers, have in recent years encouraged home shipbuilding by subvention and commercial discriminations, until their patronage has been almost entirely withdrawn from British yards. So severe has been the distress of English shipyards under these conditions that quite recently one of them contracted to build a large ship "at cost," in express terms for the sole purpose of keeping their organization together. Even Japan, which in years past has poured about thirty millions of dollars into England's coffers for ships and guns, has now begun to build her own men-of-war.

Denunciation of our navigation laws as "obsolete" is a fashionable fallacy. It is true that they are among the most venerable of our statutes, the Constitution itself antedating them only three years. But I call attention to the fact that the act of December 31, 1792, was quite as much in force from that time to 1860, when our merchant marine was at its zenith of prosperity, as now, when it is prostrate. This is a historical fact which no one can gainsay. It is therefore not easy to see why a law which promoted such prosperity as our merchant marine enjoyed prior to 1860, should exert an exactly contrary effect in 1894. At any rate it would require a new school of logic to prove that it has worked both ways. Denunciation of every business transaction between the government and steamship owners as "subsidy" is also a fashionable fad.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Steamship owners who perform public service by transporting ocean mails undoubtedly expect pay for it; but I am unable to see why a certain sum when paid to a railroad company or a river steamboat for mail-carrying under contract should be called "compensation," and when paid to an ocean steamship company for similar service should be called "subsidy."

The five maritime great powers of Europe—England, France, Germany, Russia, and Italy—during the year 1893 paid £3,331,573 sterling, or, roughly, $16,657,865, for the transportation of their mails by sea. England paid $4,360,000, including the "retainer" of 20 shillings per ton per annum to the vessels enrolled as convertible cruisers for the auxiliary fleet. France paid, including both mail compensation and tonnage bounty, $5,356,000. Germany paid, inclusive of discriminations in taxes, port dues, and lighthouse fees in favor of ships built in Germany, $1,962,000, of which $1,200,000 went to one company, the North German Lloyd.

In all these cases the transactions are considered as being in the nature of fair compensation for actual services, and no one denounces them as subsidy. It would appear that compensation for service becomes "subsidy" only when paid to an American shipowner. Summing up, it appears that the actual, practical, valid reasons for the repeal of our navigation laws are:

1. That it would open a new and much needed market for the product of over-developed English shipyards.

2. That it would offer to English shipowners opportunity to unload their obsolete and worn-out tramps from the foot of their list upon our "bargain-hunters," enabling them to recruit at the top with new ships.

3. That it would release England from her bond to keep the peace by opening an asylum for her commercial fleet whenever she might desire to make war on a maritime power.

These reasons are all English.

There are no American reasons.

CHAS. H. CRAMP.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRIVATE HISTORY OF THE "JUMPING FROG" STORY.

BY MARK TWAIN.

FIVE or six years ago a lady from Finland asked me to tell her a story in our negro dialect, so that she could get an idea of what that variety of speech was like. I told her one of Hopkinson Smith's negro stories, and gave her a copy of *Harper's Monthly* containing it. She translated it for a Swedish newspaper, but by an oversight named me as the author of it instead of Smith. I was very sorry for that, because I got a good lashing in the Swedish press, which would have fallen to his share but for that mistake; for it was shown that Boccaccio had told that very story, in his curt and meagre fashion, five hundred years before Smith took hold of it and made a good and tellable thing out of it.

I have always been sorry for Smith. But my own turn has come now. A few weeks ago Professor Van Dyke, of Princeton, asked this question:

"Do you know how old your Jumping Frog story is?"

And I answered:

"Yes—forty-five years. The thing happened in Calaveras County in the spring of 1849."

"No; it happened earlier—a couple of thousand years earlier; it is a Greek story."

I was astonished—and hurt. I said:

"I am willing to be a literary thief if it has been so ordained; I am even willing to be caught robbing the ancient dead alongside of Hopkinson Smith, for he is my friend and a good fellow, and I think would be as honest as any one if he could do it without occasioning remark; but I am not willing to antedate his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crimes by fifteen hundred years. I must ask you to knock off part of that."

But the professor was not chaffing; he was in earnest and could not abate a century. He named the Greek author, and offered to get the book and send it to me and the college text-book containing the English translation also. I thought I would like the translation best, because Greek makes me tired. January 30th he sent me the English version, and I will presently insert it in this article. It is my Jumping Frog tale in every essential. It is not strung out as I have strung it out, but it is all there.

To me this is very curious and interesting. Curious, for several reasons. For instance:

I heard the story told by a man who was not telling it to his hearers as a thing new to them, but as a thing which *they had witnessed and would remember*. He was a dull person, and ignorant; he had no gift as a story-teller, and no invention; in his mouth this episode was merely history—history and statistics; and the gravest sort of history, too; he was entirely serious, for he was dealing with what to him were austere facts, and they interested him solely because they *were* facts; he was drawing on his memory, not his mind; he saw no humor in his tale, neither did his listeners; neither he nor they ever smiled or laughed; in my time I have not attended a more solemn conference. To him and to his fellow gold-miners there were just two things in the story that were worth considering. One was, the smartness of its hero, Jim Smiley, in taking the stranger in with a loaded frog; and the other was Smiley's deep knowledge of a frog's nature—for he knew (as the narrator asserted and the listeners conceded) that a frog *likes shot* and is always ready to eat it. Those men discussed those two points, and those only. They were hearty in their admiration of them, and none of the party was aware that a first rate story had been told, in a first rate way, and that it was brimful of a quality whose presence they never suspected—humor.

Now, then, the interesting question is, *did* the frog episode happen in Angel's Camp in the spring of '49, as told in my hearing that day in the fall of 1865? I am perfectly sure that it did. I am also sure that its duplicate happened in Bœotia a couple of thousand years ago. I think it must be a case of history actually repeating itself, and not a case of a good story

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

floating down the ages and surviving because too good to be allowed to perish.

I would now like to have the reader examine the Greek story and the story told by the dull and solemn Californian, and observe how exactly alike they are in essentials.

[*Translation.*]

THE ATHENIAN AND THE FROG.*

An Athenian once fell in with a Bœotian who was sitting by the road side looking at a frog. Seeing the other approach, the Bœotian said his was a remarkable frog, and asked if he would agree to start a contest of frogs, on condition that he whose frog jumped farthest should receive a large sum of money. The Athenian replied that he would if the other would fetch him a frog, for the lake was near. To this he agreed, and when he was gone the Athenian took the frog, and opening its mouth poured some stones into its stomach, so that it did not indeed seem larger than before, but could not jump. The Bœotian soon returned with the other frog, and the contest began. The second frog first was pinched and jumped moderately; then they pinched the Bœotian frog. And he gathered himself for a leap, and used the utmost effort, but he could not move his body the least. So the Athenian departed with the money. When he was gone the Bœotian, wondering what was the matter with the frog, lifted him up and examined him. And being turned upside down, he opened his mouth and vomited out the stones.

And here is the way it happened in California:

FROM "THE CELEBRATED JUMPING FROG OF CALAVERAS COUNTY."

Well, thish-yer Smiley had rat-tarriers, and chicken cocks, and tomcats, and all them kind of things, till you couldn't rest, and you couldn't fetch nothing for him to bet on but he'd match you. He ketched a frog one day, and took him home, and said he cal'lated to educate him; and so he never done nothing for three months but set in his backyard and learn that frog to jump. And you bet you he *did* learn him, too. He'd give him a little punch behind, and the next minute you'd see that frog whirling in the air like a doughnut—see him turn one summerset, or maybe a couple if he got a good start, and come down flat-footed and all right, like a cat. He got him up so in the matter of ketching flies, and kep' him in practice so constant, that he'd nail a fly every time as fur as he could see him. Smiley said all a frog wanted was education, and he could do 'most anything—and I believe him. Why, I've seen him set Dan'l Webster down here on this floor—Dan'l Webster was the name of the frog—and sing out "Flies, Dan'l, flies!" and quicker'n you could wink he'd spring straight up and snake a fly off'n the counter there, and flop down on the floor ag'in as solid as a gob of mud, and fall to scratching the side of his head with his hind foot as indifferent as if he hadn't no idea he'd been doin' any more'n any frog might do. You never see a frog so modest and straightfor'ard as he was, for all he was so gifted. And when it come to fair and square jump-

*Sidgwick, *Greek Prose Composition*, page 116.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing on a dead level, he could get over more ground at one straddle than any animal of his breed you ever see. Jumping on a dead level was his strong suit, you understand; and when it come to that, Smiley would ante up money on him as long as he had a red. Smiley was monstrous proud of his frog, and well he might be, for fellers that had travelled and been everywheres, all said he laid over any frog that ever *they* see.

Well, Smiley kep' the beast in a little lattice box, and he used to fetch him downtown sometimes and lay for a bet. One day a feller—a stranger in the camp, he was—come acrost him with his box, and says:

"What might it be that you've got in the box?"

And Smiley says, sorter indifferent-like, "It might be a parrot, or it might be a canary, maybe, but it ain't—it's only just a frog."

And the feller took it, and looked at it careful, and turned it round this way and that, and says, "H'm—so 'tis. Well, what's *he* good for?"

"Well," Smiley says, easy and careless, "he's good enough for *one* thing, I should judge—he can outjump any frog in Calaveras County."

The feller took the box again and took another long, particular look, and give it back to Smiley and says very deliberate, "Well," he says, "I don't see no p'ints about that frog that's any better'n any other frog."

"Maybe you don't," Smiley says. "Maybe you understand frogs and maybe you don't understand 'em; maybe you've had experience, and maybe you ain't only a amature, as it were. Anyways, I've got *my* opinion and I'll resk forty dollars that he can outjump any frog in Calaveras County."

And the feller studies a minute and then says, kinder sad like, "Well, I'm only a stranger here, and I ain't got no frog, but if I had a frog I'd bet you."

And then Smiley says: "That's all right—that's all right—if you'll hold my box a minute, I'll go and get you a frog." And so the feller took the box and put up his forty dollars along with Smiley's and set down to wait.

So he set there a good while thinking and thinking to hisself, and then he got the frog out and prized his mouth open and took a teaspoon and filled him full of quail shot—filled him pretty near up to his chin—and set him on the floor. Smiley he went to the swamp and slopped around in the mud for a long time, and finally he ketched a frog and fetched him in and give him to this feller, and says:

"Now, if you're ready, set him alongside of Dan'l, with his fore-paws just even with Dan'l's, and I'll give the word." Then he says, "One—two—three—*git!*" and him and the feller touched up the frogs from behind, and the new frog hopped off lively; but Dan'l give a heave, and hysted up his shoulders—so—like a Frenchman, but it warn't no use—he couldn't budge; he was planted as solid as a church, and he couldn't no more stir than if he was anchored out. Smiley was a good deal surprised, and he was disgusted, too, but he didn't have no idea what the matter was, of course.

The feller took the money and started away; and when he was going out at the door, he sorter jerked his thumb over his shoulder—so—at Dan'l, and says again, very deliberate: "Well," he says, "*I* don't see no p'ints about that frog that's any better'n any other frog."

Smiley he stood scratching his head and looking down at Dan'l a long time, and at last he says, "I do wonder what in the nation that frog throw'd off for—I wonder if there ain't something the matter with him—he 'pears to look mighty baggy, somehow." And he ketched Dan'l by the nap of the neck, and hefted him, and says, "Why, blame my cats if he don't weigh five

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pound!" and turned him upside down and he belched out a double handful of shot. And then he see how it was, and he was the maddest man—he set the frog down and took out after that feller, but he never ketched him.

The resemblances are deliciously exact. There you have the wily Bœotian and the wily Jim Smiley waiting—two thousand years apart—and waiting, each equipped with his frog and "laying" for the stranger. A contest is proposed—for money. The Athenian would take a chance "if the other would fetch him a frog"; the Yankee says: "I'm only a stranger here and I ain't got no frog; but if I had a frog I'd bet you." The wily Bœotian and the wily Californian, with that vast gulf of two thousand years between, retire eagerly and go frogging in the marsh; the Athenian and the Yankee remain behind and work a base advantage, the one with pebbles, the other with shot. Presently the contest began. In the one case "they pinched the Bœotian frog"; in the other, "him and the feller touched up the frogs from behind." The Bœotian frog "gathered himself for a leap" (you can just *see* him!), but "could not move his body in the least"; the Californian frog "give a heave, but it warn't no use—he couldn't budge." In both the ancient and the modern cases the strangers departed with the money. The Bœotian and the Californian wonder what is the matter with their frogs; they lift them and examine; they turn them upside down and out spills the informing ballast.

Yes, the resemblances are curiously exact. I used to tell the story of the Jumping Frog in San Francisco, and presently Artemus Ward came along and wanted it to help fill out a little book which he was about to publish; so I wrote it out and sent it to his publisher, Carleton; but Carleton thought the book had enough matter in it, so he gave the story to Henry Clapp as a present, and Clapp put it in his *Saturday Press*, and it killed that paper with a suddenness that was beyond praise. At least the paper died with that issue, and none but envious people have ever tried to rob me of the honor and credit of killing it. The "Jumping Frog" was the first piece of writing of mine that spread itself through the newspapers and brought me into public notice. Consequently, the *Saturday Press* was a cocoon and I the worm in it; also, I was the gay-colored literary moth which its death set free. This simile has been used before.

Early in '66 the "Jumping Frog" was issued in book form,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with other sketches of mine. A year or two later Madame Blanc translated it into French and published it in the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* but the result was not what should have been expected, for the *Revue* struggled along and pulled through, and is alive yet. I think the fault must have been in the translation. I ought to have translated it myself. I think so because I examined into the matter and finally retranslated the sketch from the French back into English, to see what the trouble was; that is, to see just what sort of a focus the French people got upon it. Then the mystery was explained. In French the story is too confused, and chaotic, and unreposeful, and ungrammatical, and insane; consequently it could only cause grief and sickness—it could not kill. A glance at my retranslation will show the reader that this must be true.

[*My Retranslation.*]

THE FROG JUMPING OF THE COUNTY OF CALAVERAS.

Eh bien! this Smiley nourished some terriers á rats, and some cocks of combat, and some cats, and all sort of things; and with his rage of betting one no had more of repose. He trapped one day a frog and him imported with him (et l'emporta chez lui) saying that he pretended to make his education. You me believe if you will, but during three months he not has nothing done but to him apprehend to jump (apprendre a sauter) in a court retired of her mansion (de sa maison). And I you respond that he have succeeded. He him gives a small blow by behind, and the instant after you shall see the frog turn in the air like a grease-biscuit, make one summersault, sometimes two, when she was well started, and re-fall upon his feet like a cat. He him had accomplished in the art of to gobble the flies (gober des mouches), and him there exercised continually—so well that a fly at the most far that she appeared was a fly lost. Smiley had custom to say that all which lacked to a frog it was the education, but with the education she could do nearly all—and I him believe. Tenez, I him have seen pose Daniel Webster there upon this plank—Daniel Webster was the name of the frog—and to him sing, "Some flies, Daniel, some flies!"—in a flash of the eye Daniel had bounded and seized a fly here upon the counter, then jumped anew at the earth, where he rested truly to himself scratch the head with his behind-foot, as if he no had not the least idea of his superiority. Never you not have seen frog as modest, as natural, sweet as she was. And when he himself agitated to jump purely and simply upon plain earth, she does more ground in one jump than any beast of his species than you can know.

To jump plain—this was his strong. When he himself agitated for that Smiley multiplied the bets upon her as long as there to him remained a red. It must to know, Smiley was monstrously proud of his frog, and he of it was right, for some men who were traveled, who had all seen, said that they to him would be injurious to him compare to another frog. Smiley guarded Daniel in a little box latticed which he carried bytimes to the village for some bet.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One day an individual stranger at the camp him arrested with his box and him said:

"What is this that you have then shut up there within?"

Smiley said, with an air indifferent:

"That could be a paroquet, or a syringe (*ou un serin*), but this no is nothing of such, it not is but a frog."

The individual it took, it regarded with care, it turned from one side and from the other, then he said:

"*Tiens!* in effect!—At what is she good?"

"My God!" respond Smiley, always with an air disengaged, "she is good for one thing, to my notice, (*à mon avis*), she can batter in jumping (*elle peut batter en sautant*) all frogs of the county of Calaveras."

The individual re-took the box, it examined of new longly, and it rendered to Smiley in saying with an air deliberate:

"*Eh bien!* I no saw not that that frog had nothing of better than each frog." (*Je ne vois pas que cette grenouille ait rien de mieux qu'aucune grenouille*). [If that isn't grammar gone to seed, then I count myself no judge.—M. T.]

"Possible that you not it saw not," said Smiley, "possible that you—you comprehend frogs; possible that you not you there comprehend nothing; possible that you had of the experience, and possible that you not be but an amateur. Of all manner (*De toute manière*) I bet forty dollars that she batter in jumping no matter which frog of the county of Calaveras."

The individual reflected a second, and said like sad:

"I not am but a stranger here, I no have not a frog; but if I of it had one, I would embrace the bet."

"Strong, well!" respond Smiley; "nothing of more facility. If you will hold my box a minute, I go you to search a frog (*j'irai vous chercher*)."

Behold, then, the individual, who guards the box, who puts his forty dollars upon those of Smiley, and who attends (*et qui attend*). He attended enough longtimes, reflecting all solely. And figure you that he takes Daniel, him opens the mouth by force and with a tea-spoon him fills with shot of the hunt, even him fills just to the chin, then he him puts by the earth. Smiley during these times was at slopping in a swamp. Finally he trapped (*attrape*) a frog, him carried to that individual, and said:

"Now if you be ready, put him all against Daniel, with their before-feet upon the same line, and I give the signal"—then he added: "One, two, three—advance!"

Him and the individual touched their frogs by behind, and the frog new put to jump smartly, but Daniel himself lifted ponderously, exalted the shoulders thus, like a Frenchman—to what good? he could not budge, he is planted solid like a church, he not advance no more than if one him had put at the anchor.

Smiley was surprised and disgusted, but he not himself doubted not of the turn being intended (*mais il ne se doutait pas du tour bien entendu*). The individual empocketed the silver, himself with it went, and of it himself in going is that he no gives not a jerk of thumb over the shoulder—like that—at the poor Daniel, in saying with his air deliberate—(*L'individu empoche l'argent s'en va et en s'en allant est ce qu'il ne donne pas un coup de pouce par-dessus l'épaule, comme ça, au pauvre Daniel, en disant de son air délibéré.*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Eh bien! *I no see not that that frog has nothing of better than another.*"

Smiley himself scratched longtimes the head, the eyes fixed upon Daniel, until that which at last he said:

"I me demand how the devil it makes itself that this beast has refused. Is it that she had something? One would believe that she is stuffed."

He grasped Daniel by the skin of the neck, him lifted and said:

"The wolf me bite if he no weigh not five pounds."

He him reversed and the unhappy belched two handfuls of shot (*et le malheureux*, etc).—When Smiley recognized how it was, he was like mad. He deposited his frog by the earth and ran after that individual, but he not him caught never.

It may be that there are people who can translate better than I can, but I am not acquainted with them.

So ends the private and public history of the jumping frog of Calaveras County, an incident which has this unique feature about it—that it is both old and new, a "chestnut" and not a "chestnut"; for it was original when it happened two thousand years ago, and was again original when it happened in California in our own time.

MARK TWAIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORGERY AS A PROFESSION.

BY ROBERT A. PINKERTON.

PROFESSIONAL forgers usually make their homes in large cities. They are constantly studying schemes and organizing gangs of men to defraud banks, trust companies, and money lenders by means of forged checks, notes, drafts, bills of exchange, letters of credit, and in some instances altering registered government and other bonds, and counterfeiting the bonds of corporations. These bonds they dispose of or hypothecate to obtain loans on.

A professional forgery gang consists of: First, a capitalist or backer; second, the actual forger, who is known among his associates as the "scratcher"; third, the man who acts as confidential agent for the forger, who is known as the "middleman" or the "go-between"; fourth, the man who presents the forged paper at the bank for payment, who is known as the "layer-down" or "presenter."

When it is necessary to have a capitalist or backer connected with a gang, he furnishes the funds for the organization, frequently lays out the plans of work and obtains the genuine paper from which forgeries are made. He will, when necessary, find the engraver, the lithographer, and, most important of all, the "professional" forger, who will do the actual forgery work.

The professional forger has, as a rule, considerable knowledge of chemicals which enables him to alter checks, drafts, bills of exchange, letters of credit, or to change the names on registered bonds. He is something of an artist, too, for with a fine camel's-hair brush he can restore the most delicate tints in bank safety paper, where the tints have been destroyed by the use of acids; in fact, no bank safety paper is a protection against him. When the amount of the genuine draft or check is perforated in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paper, certain professional forgers have reached that point in their work where they fill up the perforations with paper pulp, then with a hot iron press it out so that it is a very difficult matter to detect the alterations even with the use of the finest microscope. This done and the writing cleaned off the face of the draft, check, letter of credit, or bill of exchange, with only the genuine signature left and the tints on the paper restored, the forger is prepared to fill up the paper for any amount decided upon.

The backer or capitalist is rarely known to any member of the gang outside of the "go-between," whom he makes use of to find the forger. He very rarely allows himself to become known to the men who "present" the forged paper at the banks. If the forgery scheme is successful, the backer receives back the money paid out for the preparation of the work, as well as any amount he may have loaned the "band" to enable them to open accounts at banks where they propose placing the forged paper. He is also allowed a certain percentage on all successful forgeries. This percentage will run from 20 to 30 per cent., but where the backer and forger are working together, their joint percentage is never less than 50 per cent.

The duties of the "middleman" or "go-between" are to receive from the forger or his confidential agent the altered or forged paper. He finds the man to "present" the same, accompanies his confederates on their forgery trips throughout the country, acts as the agent of the backer in dealing out money for expenses, sees that their plan of operations is carried out, and, in fact, becomes the general manager of the band. He is in full control of the men who act as "presenters" of the forged paper. If there be more than one man to "present" the paper, the middleman, as a rule, will not allow them to become known to each other. He meets them in secluded places, generally in little out-of-the-way saloons. In summer-time a favorite meeting place is some secluded spot in the public parks. At one meeting he makes an appointment for the next meeting. He uses great care in making these appointments, so that the different "presenters" do not come together and thereby become known to each other. The middleman is usually selected for his firmness of character. He must be a man known among criminals as a "staunch" man, one who can-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not be easily frightened by detectives when arrested, no matter what pressure may be brought to bear upon him. He must have such an acquaintanceship among criminals as will enable him to select other men who are "staunch" and who are not apt to talk and tell their business, whether sober or under the influence of liquor. It is from among this class of acquaintances that he selects the men to "present" the forged paper. It is an invariable rule followed by the backer and forger that in selecting a middleman they select one who not only has the reputation of being a "staunch" man, but he must also be a man who has at least one record of conviction standing against him. This is for the additional protection of the backer and forger, as they know that in law the testimony of an accomplice who is also an ex-convict, should he conclude to become a state's witness, would have to be strongly corroborated before a court or jury in order to be believed.

As the capitalist and forger, for self-protection, use great care in selecting a "middleman," the middleman to protect himself also uses the same care in the selection of men to "present" the forged paper. He endeavors, like the backer and forger, to throw as much protection around himself as possible, and for the same reasons he also uses ex-convicts as the men to "present" the forged paper at the banks. The "presenters" are of all ages and appearances, from the party who will pass as an errand boy, messenger, porter, or clerk to the prosperous business man, horse trader, stock buyer, or farmer. When a presenter enters a bank to "lay down" a forged paper, the "go-between" will sometimes enter the bank with him, and stand outside the counter noting carefully if there is any suspicious action on the part of the paying teller when the forged paper is presented to him; and whether the "presenter" carries himself properly and does his part well. But usually the middleman prefers waiting outside the bank for the "presenter," possibly watching him through a window from the street. If the "presenter" is successful and gets the money on the forged paper, the middleman will follow him when he leaves the bank to some convenient spot where, without attracting attention, he receives the money. He then gives the presenter another piece of forged paper drawn on some other bank in the immediate neighborhood, accompanying him also to this bank, and so they go from bank to bank, usually victimizing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from three to five banks in each city, their work being completed generally in less than an hour's time. All money obtained from the various banks on the forged paper is immediately turned over to the middleman, who furnishes all the money for current expenses. After the work is completed, the presenters leave the city by different routes, first having agreed on a meeting point in some neighboring city. The "presenters" frequently walk out of the city to some outlying station on the line of the road they propose to take to their next destination. This precaution is taken to avoid arrest at the depot in case the forgery is discovered before they can leave the city. At the next meeting-point the middleman, having deducted the expenses advanced, pays the "presenters" their percentage of the money obtained on the forged paper.

A band of professional forgers before starting out always agree on a basis of division of all moneys obtained on their forgery paper. This division might be about as follows: For a presenter where the amount to be drawn does not exceed $2,000, 15 to 25 per cent.; but where the amount to be drawn is from $3,000 to $5,000 and upwards, the "presenter" receives from 35 to 45 per cent. The price is raised as the risk increases, and it is generally considered a greater risk to attempt to pass a check or draft of a large denomination than a smaller one. The middleman gets from 15 to 25 per cent. His work is more, and his responsibility is greater, but the risk is less. There are plenty of middlemen to be had, but the "presenters" are scarce. The "shadow," when one accompanies the band, is sometimes paid a salary by the middleman and his expenses, but at other times he is allowed a small percentage, not to exceed 5 per cent. and his expenses, as with ordinary care his risk is very slight. The backer and forger get the balance, which usually amounts to from 50 to 60 per cent. The expenses that have been advanced the men who go out on the road are usually deducted at the final division.

In case of the arrest of one of the "presenters" in the act of "laying down" forged paper, the middleman or shadow immediately notifies other members of the band who may be in the city. All attempts to get money from the other banks are stopped, and the other members of the band leave the city as best they can to meet at some designated point in a near-by city. Out of their first suc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cessful forgeries a certain sum from each man's share is held by the "middleman" to be used in the defence of any member of the band who may be arrested on the trip. This money is called "fall money," and is used to employ counsel for the men under arrest, or to do anything for them that may be for their interest. Any part of this money not used is paid back in proportion to the amount advanced to the various members of the band from whose share it has been retained. Sometimes, however, in forming a band of forgers there is an understanding or agreement entered into at the outset, that each man "stand on his own bottom"—that is, if arrested, take care of himself. When this is agreed to, the men arrested must get out as best they can. Under these circumstances there is no assessment for "fall money," but usually the men who present the paper insist on "fall money" being put up, as it assures them the aid of some one of the band working earnestly in their behalf and watching their interests, outside of the attorney retained.

When a "middleman" is exceedingly cautious and not entirely satisfied with the "presenters," he will sometimes have an assistant. This is where the "shadow" comes in. This shadow will, under the directions of the "middleman," follow the presenter into the bank and report fully on his actions. He sometimes catches the "presenter" in an attempt to swindle his companions by claiming that he did not get the money, but had to get out of the bank in a hurry and leave the check or draft, as the paying teller was suspicious. A "presenter" caught at this trick is sometimes sent into a bank to present a forged check where the bank has been previously warned of his coming by an anonymous letter, written by or at the instigation of one of the leaders. This is done as a punishment for his dishonesty, and as a warning to the other "presenters" not to attempt this treachery. Usually, however, a dishonest member is quietly dropped. The "shadow" will follow the "presenters" from the time they get the forged paper from the middleman until they hand the money over to him. A good "shadow" is always useful to the middleman, who does not allow him to become known to his confederates.

When one of the party is arrested, an attorney is at once sent to him. As a rule, in selecting an attorney, one is employed who is known as a good criminal lawyer. It is also preferred that he should be a lawyer who has some political weight. The mid-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dleman employs the attorney, and pays him out of the "fall money." The arrested man is strictly instructed by the attorney to do no talking, and is usually encouraged by the promise that they will have him out in a short time. In order to keep him quiet, this promise is frequently renewed by the attorney acting for the "middleman." This is done to prevent a confession being made in case the arrested man should show signs of weakening. Finally, when he is forced to stand trial, if the case is one certain of conviction, the attorney will get him to plead guilty, with the promise of a short sentence, and will then bargain to this end with the court or prosecutor. Thus guided by the attorney selected and acting for the "middleman" and his associates, the prisoner pleads guilty, and frequently discovers, when it is too late, that he has been tricked into keeping his mouth shut in the interests of his associates. It is but fair to state, however, that if money can save an arrested party, and if his associates have it, they will use it freely among attorneys or "jury fixers," where the latter can be made use of, and frequently it is paid to politicians who make a pretence of having a "pull" with the prosecuting officers or the court.

Many banks are swindled in the United States and Canada yearly by bands of professional forgers. One or more of them will go to a town or city, buy a draft for $15 or $25, which they "raise" to any amount they think they can have cashed. To establish identification various methods and tricks are resorted to. Frequently these men will have their signatures forwarded by mail by the bank issuing the draft, and where it is a check they will forge the guarantee of the maker of the check to the indorsement or will forge the name of a firm near the bank, whose signature is known at the bank guaranteeing the indorsement. Within the past year two members (presenters) of one of these forgery bands have been arrested; one a year after he had presented the forged drafts to a bank in a Western city. He was dying of consumption when arrested, and was never able to be moved to the scene of his forgeries. In one of the banks where this man had been successful in obtaining money on the forged drafts, he was taken with a coughing spell while waiting for the money to be counted over to him by the paying teller, who, as he afterwards expressed it, paid him the money quickly, being afraid the man would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

die at the counter. This "presenter" was one of the "staunch men," as it is said he would never open his lips previous to his death as to who his associates were. Another member of this band who was recently arrested in a Southern city, was convicted and sentenced to five years' imprisonment, having been arrested in the act of "presenting" a forged draft. It is sometimes a difficult matter to convict a "presenter" of forged paper unless he is arrested immediately after presenting the paper, for the reason that bank tellers, after a lapse of a few days or possibly weeks, cannot be relied upon to identify the man who "presented" the paper. Many banks on whom forgeries have been perpetrated are unwilling to incur the expense of hunting down forgers, for fear the matter should become public and thereby hurt their standing or reflect on their business management. For this reason they frequently suppress the facts and charge the forgeries to profit and loss. It is a difficult matter to get evidence to convict either the capitalist or actual forger, for as a rule, in order to convict either of these, it is necessary to get a confession from the "presenter" or the "middleman," and then corroborate his statements in order to have them believed. As a rule, the "presenter" cannot furnish the evidence to convict the backer or the actual forger, because he seldom knows either of them, as he always does his business through the "middleman." It is frequently the case that the capitalist or forger is not in the city where the forgeries are committed. They prepare the work and the middleman and "presenters" get the money. The general public, or in fact, banks, have but a slight idea of the ramifications of a forgery band.

In my opinion there is but one way to stamp out professional forgery. Let the banks enter into a union having this for its object. A union of this kind could be organized and maintained at very little cost to each member of the association. When a forgery is perpetrated on a member of the association, prompt and vigorous action could then be taken. The detectives employed by the association could be sent to the scene of the forgery almost immediately after the forgery was discovered; and by their knowledge of the men engaged in this class of work, and by persistent efforts on their part, in time the leaders of these bands and their tools would be convicted and sentenced. The victimized banks would not be put to the cost of tracing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

down the parties who had committed these forgeries, as this would be attended to by the association, whose executive officers would also decide on the detectives to be employed, and advise with them at all times as to their plans and the progress of the work. In forming an association of this kind the first principle should be "no compromise." An earnest effort should be made to get the forgers and recover as much of the money obtained by them as is possible, but a prosecution to convicition should be certain. In the United States to-day there are not a dozen men who will enter into the business of backing a forgery band, and there are not over five or six men in the United States who have the ability and are willing to use it as professional forgers. The conviction of one backer or one actual forger would do more good than the conviction of fifty "presenters." On account of the many safeguards with which the backers and forgers surround themselves it might not be an easy matter to connect them with each forgery they might be concerned in, but by constant watchfulness it could be accomplished.

As an illustration of the value of such an association as a bankers' union, the case of the Jewellers' Protective Union and the Jewellers' Security Alliance might be cited. These two organizations were organized in the city of New York, and their officers reside there. They have been in existence a number of years and have been very successful in causing the arrest and punishment of professional thieves who make it a business to rob travelling jewellery salesmen or burglarize jewellers' safes. Before the formation of these associations the stealing of the trunks of travelling jewellery salesmen and the burglarizing of their safes were quite common occurrences, there being anywhere from one to six robberies in a year. The action taken against jewellery thieves, causing their arrest and severe punishment, almost put a stop to this class of thievery. Most of the men who made it a business and a study to relieve travelling jewellery salesmen of their trunks and stock are in prison, and those not there have chosen some other line of thievery less dangerous. Professional thieves have been made to understand that if they will persist in robbing jewellery salesmen or jewellers' safes, who are under protection of either of these associations, they are sure to be punished. Professional thieves are not looking for trouble, and, as a rule, will avoid it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An association of banks contending against professional forgers would be just as successful as either of the two jewellery associations, and even more so, as, in the first place, the number of actual professional forgers is limited. Conviction of the men who are the actual forgers and the backers would put the middlemen and "presenters" out of business, as it is not in their power to do the forgery work.

Another instance showing that professional forgery can be stamped out in the United States is the success that has crowned the efforts of the government in virtually putting a stop to the counterfeiting of government notes. Previous to the Civil War a large number of "crooked" engravers and lithographers were actively engaged in counterfeiting the State Bank bills. When the United States and National Bank currency was adopted, these men turned their attention to counterfeiting the government money. To contend against these counterfeiters the government found it necessary to organize the United States Secret Service, in which a large number of detectives were employed and stationed at various points throughout the United States and Canada. Within a few years the counterfeiting of United States currency was checked, and it is now almost extinct. The leaders of these bands, capitalists, backers, engravers, and lithographers, have been arrested, sentenced, and many of them are in prison. The United States Secret Service is still kept up, under a chief who reports directly to the Secretary of the Treasury, but the force has been greatly reduced, and the counterfeiting of the United States and the National Bank notes has been reduced to a minimum, if not entirely stopped. This has been brought about by making punishment certain for all who engaged in counterfeiting government notes. The counterfeiting of silver coins is still carried on to a certain extent, mostly by Italians, with plaster molds, but even this is almost stopped.

A combination of banks would bring about the same results. Capitalists and actual forgers would be reached and punished or driven out of the business into some other line of thievery. Just as the burglar and "sneak" thief have been made to respect these jewellery associations, and the counterfeiter has been made to understand that he must not meddle with the Government's money, so the professional forger would come to understand that in laying

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out his plans to commit a forgery, one of the first points for him to ascertain would be, "Does this bank belong to the bankers' association for the prosecution of forgers?" If the paying tellers in banks belonging to the association were able to have a notice over their windows, stating that the bank was under the protection of the bankers' protective association, the first thing a professional forger or "presenter" of forged paper would do would be to look for this notioe. In time professional forgers would be made to so respect this notice that there would be but a slight chance of a bank belonging to this association being swindled by professional forgers.

The initiation fee, and thereafter the annual dues, would undoubtedly not only support the association, but they could lay up a surplus as their membership increased. An association somewhat similar to the one I have outlined is said to exist in London. If any of its members are forged upon, the forgers are followed over the world, brought back, and punished for their crimes.

The American professional forger is the most expert of any of his class in the world. Bands of American forgers have travelled all over Europe and South America, perpetrating forgeries, and have been quite successful. The great Bank of England forgeries were perpetrated by Americans. These were the largest forgeries ever conceived and carried out successfully by a professional forgery band, and if it had not been for a mere accident in the forger's failing to put in a date on a bill of acceptance, they would have cost the Bank of England $3,000,000 instead of $600,000. Had there been an association of bankers in the United States for protection against professional forgers, the probabilities are that the Bank of England forgery could have been prevented, as it was known to American detectives at the time that there was a band of American forgers working in Europe, who were making their headquarters in London.

ROBERT A. PINKERTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TARIFF REFORM AND MONETARY REFORM.

BY PRESIDENT E. B. ANDREWS, OF BROWN UNIVERSITY.

THE fundamental truth on which the policy of tariff reform is based is that the world of commerce is by nature a continuous unity. Any measure or system which tends to hedge it off into districts or departments is more or less artificial, and therefore, if justifiable at all, justifiable only on account of some temporary stress or other circumstance foreign to the normal order of society. Starting out from this principle, I desire to show that at the present time tariff reform depends upon monetary reform, and can never achieve its end in any satisfactory degree without a radical modification of the monetary conditions which now prevail.

It is universally admitted that since 1873 there has been an extraordinary appreciation of gold, or, what is the same thing, an extraordinary fall in general prices; but no one, so far as I am aware, has noticed what a decided forensic advantage this gives high protectionists in their argument against tariff reformers. In the last presidential canvass anti-protectionists incessantly inveighed against the McKinley Bill on the ground that it had raised prices. They were able to prove that it had raised some prices, but that it had elevated prices generally they could not prove. On the contrary, the figures gathered by the Senate Committee showed that after the McKinley Act went into effect general prices slightly fell. This result was undoubtedly due in part to the inclusion of sugar in the Senate statistics; but the rise of general prices under the McKinley Act, even aside from sugar, was insignificant. Because of this, many believed, and still believe, that the whole outcry against the law sprang either from error or from a purpose to deceive voters.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What the McKinley legislation did do, beyond all question, was to enhance the intrinsic costs of things, to increase the amount of exertion which our people in general were having to put forth in order to procure a given number of pounds, yards, bushels, etc., of the various goods necessary to their subsistence. It did not raise prices in general, but it did raise costs in general. That few people saw this, was due to the natural but very perverse habit of confusing prices with costs, as if the two were either identical or always varied in the same direction. The tendency of a protective tariff to elevate prices had in this case been partially or wholly offset by the fall in prices involved in the appreciation of gold.

Had there been no appreciation of gold, that is, no downward movement in general prices, caused by paucity of full money in our part of the world, the consequence of the McKinley law would have been a considerable rise of prices. The nature of that legislation would thus have been made so apparent that the recent victory for reform would have been overwhelming and final. The nation's verdict in the matter would have been so decisive as to settle forever the question what sort of a tariff policy the United States should pursue. As it is, this cannot be said to have been the case. If any expect the lowering of our customs duties to be from this time an easy and certain thing, they are, in my judgment, much mistaken. The cause still has great obstacles to overcome, in which all possible help will be needed. It is extremely desirable that the fall of prices which obscures, and, unless stopped, will go on obscuring the inevitable effect of high tariffs, should be obviated if possible.

It is necessary to insist with extreme emphasis upon this difference between prices and costs. Pardon me, therefore, for dwelling a few moments longer upon the dense and painful misunderstanding upon this point which afflicts many perfectly intelligent people. The statement is continually made that falling prices are advantageous, just what one ought to wish, as the signs of advancing wealth, comfort, and civilization. The proposition needs amendment. What is desirable is that the costs of commodities should decrease, but it is not necessary that this decrease should be accompanied by a fall in prices. It may even be accompanied by a rise in prices, as was the case after 1848.

All are glad, certainly, to have the costs of things become less and less. This process has been going on since 1873. Had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this alone occurred, no one would complain. There are two proofs that this is not all which has been doing. One is that intrinsic costs were falling between 1848 and 1873—falling as rapidly as since 1873. But prices then were rising rather than falling and it was a period of extraordinary prosperity everywhere. Another evidence that the fall in the intrinsic costs of things since 1873 has had a baneful accompaniment of some sort is as follows: Falling costs imply prosperity. The signs of a *régime* of falling costs are high interest and dividends, good wages and profits, happy merchants, manufacturers, bankers, and workmen; few failures, few strikes and lockouts, rapidly multiplying industrial undertakings, and rapidly increasing wealth. This is not a picture of the world's economic life for the last twenty years. Costs have fallen, doubtless, but the fall in prices has not consisted solely or mainly in reduced costs.

Just so, an advance in prices may mean an advance in costs, as is often or usually the case when prices are put up by a tariff; or it may mean merely an increase in the volume of money, without increase or even with decrease in costs, as was the case after 1850. I have nowhere seen these distinctions properly observed; and because they are not observed, people of much information talk very absurdly upon the subject. One class hails with joy a rise of prices, whatever its cause; another laments it, whatever its cause. So, when prices decline, many imagine that the decline must mean a lessening of the effort necessary to get commodities, and they utter hallelujahs accordingly.

It is quite conceivable that costs should go one way and prices another, that costs in general should fall, so that the community needs less effort year by year to get a certain amount of satisfactions, and yet gives for those satisfactions a greater number of the units of money year by year. This is what was taking place after 1850. The reverse may also occur; that is, costs may increase or may remain stationary, and yet prices decrease. The McKinley tariff added to the costs of all or most things which it affected, but an unhappy appreciation of gold, to a great extent prevented this increase of cost—this addition to the effort necessary to obtain things—from taking effect in the form of higher prices. This obscuration of fact, I repeat, gave in the canvass, and continues to give, to the high tariff party a prodigious advantage in argument. There is no doubt that, in the election, it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

secured for high tariff multitudes of votes. It keeps in favor thereof numbers of men who, but for it, would prefer reform, and it will continue to have this effect so long as the source of the error lasts. The condition producing the mistake ought to be cancelled by arresting the appreciation of gold through an increase in the volume of full or exportable money.

With this support which the appreciation of gold gives the protectionist as a debater, is closely connected the impulse toward protection with which it plies him if, as is usual, he is also a producer. The first of these considerations relates to logic, appealing to the mind; the second is economic, addressing itself to the pocket. Producers as such always like to see prices rise; and up to the figure where the increase begins to limit sales so as to lower total profit, they are sure to use their influence in favor of an advancing market. When prices threaten or begin to fall, producers redouble their efforts as bulls. At such a time stock depreciates upon manufacturers' hands. Spontaneously struggling to avert this, they welcome any resource that bids fair to aid. Unable to compass their ends in other ways, they are moved to agitate for protection, which often, when it does not out and out elevate or stay the prices of goods, prevents them from falling as low as they would fall otherwise. If, as has almost always been the case in our country, manufacturers are foremost in framing the nation's fiscal policy, this is in any event sure to be protective, but it will be doubly so if they change it while prices are sinking.

That the consideration here touched has been most potent in the revived protectionist agitation which has swept over the world since the time when prices began to fall, hardly admits of doubt.* Since 1891, even New South Wales succumbs to this drift. The two phenomena are connected not alone in point of time, but logically, just as those of low duties and progress toward free trade after 1845 are connected with the rise of prices during the same period. As to times more recent, I have no hesitation in saying that had prices since the war been stationary or only slowly advancing, the rise in tariff rates so much bewailed would not only have been impossible, but would never have been thought of; and the painful effort which we are now making to rationalize our fiscal system would have been unnecessary.

* The rise of trusts and other combinations of capital is due to the same cause. In times of falling prices, production is extra hazardous, and such as engage in it feel the need of some special shelter, defence, or insurance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Unless something can be done to remedy the world's monetary disorders, the manufacturing classes will continue as in recent years to be arrayed in almost solid phalanx against tariff reform, whereas, if the fall of prices could be checked, one principal motive now prompting them to such an attitude would happily fall away. This motive, now, has a certain justification, which even free traders must admit.

A special incentive just now operative in the United States spurs protectionists here to try and maintain high customs duties. It is the fact that we must retain our gold. In the East, nearly all our citizens admit this necessity, whatever their views regarding the tariff. As is well known, we produce several commodities which Europe must have, while few of our wants are of such a nature that we cannot, by sufficient expense, provide for them at home. By thwarting somewhat the disposition of people in Europe to settle with us in commodities, we compel them to send us more gold than they otherwise would. If the pressure for gold now so rife in all European countries could be removed, then this particular American ground for favoring protection would also be removed, and reform would be indefinitely easier in consequence. Otherwise the fight for gold cannot but plague us badly in settling a new tariff. Provided we are going to keep our gold, we cannot permit Europe too easily to liquidate in goods the debts she incurs on our side the ocean. The present Congress encountered this difficulty in its very first debate on the tariff, and will have to reckon with it at every step. Should the Wilson bill become law, and immense new importations under it send all our gold to Europe, many who have voted for it would curse the day when they did so.

Tariff reform proposes to do much for the American farmer, and it will do much, but its benign effect in this way must be painfully restricted unless silver can be brought back to or toward its old-time value-relation with gold. Many wonder at Great Britain's obstinacy in refusing to do aught that might help on the rehabilitation of silver. The opposition of the creditor interest is commonly considered the cause of this. It is one cause, but there is another quite as strong—the determination of the entire non-agricultural population of Great Britain to maintain the present low price of wheat. This having resulted from the appreciation of gold, Lord Rosebery and his followers see that,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were silver to be reinstated, wheat prices would considerably advance.

The appreciation of gold depresses the price of wheat in London by powerfully stimulating the importation of wheat from India. Let us recur to the days when gold was only fifteen and a half times as precious as silver. Suppose that then four shillings in gold, two rupees in silver, and a bushel of wheat were equal in value each to each. A Mark Lane dealer sends to India two rupees' worth of silver for a bushel of wheat, getting his rupees by paying four shillings' worth of gold. Now change the supposition: Gold appreciates, so that the two rupees will buy only three shillings instead of four, as previously. That is, silver has fallen in relation to gold 25 per cent., and gold has risen in relation to silver 33⅓ per cent. Wheat, too, has fallen in relation to gold, but not so much as silver, so that, say, a bushel will exchange for three and a half shillings gold. Observe, now, how the appreciation of gold blesses our Mark Lane wheatmonger. The rupee or silver price of wheat in India has not changed. His two rupees will, as before, set a bushel of wheat going from Calcutta to London. He now, however, gets his rupees for three shillings gold, while his wheat brings him three and a half shillings gold. That is, he makes sixpence gold on every bushel. To aid simplicity I have made these figures gross and general and have taken no account of freight or exchange. But, though more or less inexact in detail, the supposition perfectly illustrates the effect which the dislocation of the old value-relation between the precious metals has had in filling London with Indian wheat. The profit, of course, does not continue so high as indicated, but is lowered by competition. This lowering comes about by a fall in the gold price of wheat in England, which not only more and more cuts down the London market for American wheat, but depresses the price of wheat to the remotest farm in the United States.

The correctness of the theory just stated is sometimes challenged on the ground that if it were correct the silver price of wheat would, through stimulation of the demand, have risen in India, which has not been the case. This apparent anomaly is easily explained. There has no doubt been a tendency to such rise, but it has been balanced by the counter-tendency toward cheapness put in exercise by the immense multiplication in India,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during recent years, of railways and other facilities for easy transportation. In this roundabout yet inevitable way, both the American market for wheat and the American price thereof are kept down by the appreciation of gold. A similar analysis could be given in relation to cotton, only here the British pressure in favor of low prices through dear gold is offset somewhat by the difficulty which dear gold gives the cotton people themselves in preserving their market abroad. Of this I shall say more presently. Meantime, it seems to me absolutely certain that the production of the two great staples mentioned can never be duly profitable in America till the gold price of silver is much raised; that is, the appreciation of gold checked.

Tariff reform sees still another powerful reason why silver ought to be brought back to a certain regular parity with gold. It is a reason of which we in America have thought little, but we cannot permanently ignore it. I refer to the lack of a fixed par, a mint par, between the gold-using and the silver-using portions of the world. The distress which the absence of such a par has produced in England is among the chief causes for the great increase of sentiment there favorable to bimetallism. It is found that trade between England and India has come to be little more than a game of chance. All the people engaged in it or acquainted with it pronounce its condition intolerable. We Americans have been accustomed to think of this evil as having little importance for us, but we are certainly in error. All parties are agreed that it is already desirable and must soon be indispensable to increase our foreign trade. Some would promote this by subsidies upon steamship lines between our own and foreign countries. Others prefer the method of reducing duties. But no intelligent American will deny that in some way or other the exports from the United States of America must immensely increase if the prosperity of our country is to go on. A very great part of the new exports must go to the lands which have silver as the basis of their currency, as China, Mexico, Central and South America. We ought to be the principal purveyors of manufactured goods to all these regions. No other great manufacturing nation is so near them. Far too long have we been sluggish touching this important interest. Even the last election has hardly awakened us. When the matter is studied as it deserves to be, our people will not rest until they begin to utilize

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this gigantic possibility. Now the friction in exchange between the gold-using and the silver-using populations of mankind is about the worst conceivable barrier to the execution of this splendid scheme. It may seem a strong statement, yet I am of the opinion, after much reflection, that the demonetization of silver in 1873, annihilating all money par between rich and populous sections of humanity, sections which more than any others ought to be trading freely together because their natural products are so diverse, is doing more to repress commerce than all the tariffs in existence. This is why the exports from Great Britain to the East have for many years been either falling off or increasing at a snail's pace in comparison with the progress they ought to have made. Excepting a few writers for the London press, I do not believe that an intelligent Englishman can be found who will not trace this loss to the crazy condition of exchange.

The same evil affects Mexico as well. At the Monetary Conference the Mexican delegates submitted a paper which gave impressive testimony to this fact. Among other documents which they laid before the Conference was a table illustrating the frequency and sweep of the variations in Mexican exchange upon London for the years 1889 and 1890. Here is that table:

	1889.				1890.			
Months.	Max.	Min.	Var.	No. of Var.	Max.	Min.	Var.	No. of Var.
	Pence.	Pence.			Pence.	Pence		
January	35 3/4	35 1/4	1/2	7	37 5/8	37 3/8	1/4	8
February	35 5/8	35	5/8	6	37 5/8	36 1/2	1/8	9
March	35 1/2	35 5/8	1/8	1	37 5/8	36 1/2	1/8	15
April	35 3/8	35 1/4	1/8	1	39	37 1/8	1 7/8	13
May	35 3/16	35 3/16	3/16	2	39 3/4	38 1/4	1 1/2	8
June	35 1/8	35 1/2	3/8	2	41 1/2	39 1/4	2 1/4	11
July	35 1/8	35 3/8	1/2	3	42 1/2	40 3/4	1 3/4	8
August	35 1/16	35 3/8	5/16	3	45 1/2	42 1/4	3 1/4	9
September	36 1/8	35 3/4	3/8	6	45 5/8	44	2 5/8	10
October	37 1/4	35 1/4	2	6	43 1/4	40 3/4	2 1/8	17
November	37 3/4	37 1/8	5/8	11	41 3/4	37	4 3/8	14
December	37 1/8	37 1/4	5/8	12	41 1/2	39 1/4	2 1/4	13

Similar variations in exchange rates between the gold and silver portions of the globe are of course taking place at all points. Yet those are precisely the exchanges which are most important for the advance of human weal and civilization.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The last fall in the gold price of silver has greatly aggravated this evil.

This obstruction of international exchange operates exactly like a high protective tariff, forcing nations to use at home what they could more profitably export, and produce at home what they could more profitably import. Capital and labor are thus driven into needlessly unremunerative channels, and the average welfare of men kept down. It was recently stated in Parliament that "eighteen cotton mills are at this moment being erected in Bombay and two in England." During the year between July 1, 1890, and July 1, 1891, nine factories were building in India. One hundred and twenty-five in all were then in operation there, with 24,531 looms and 3,351,694 spindles. There were then 110,000 Indian laborers engaged in this industry, and they used 40 per cent. of the about 300,000,000 bales of cotton produced in India. Within ten years the number of hands has multiplied threefold, and the amount of cotton wrought by them more than fourfold. It is true that the import of woollen yarn into India from England still keeps up, but it does little more than this, and is mainly confined to the finer lines. Even if the establishment of this Indian manufacture involved no loss to England so far as her trade to India itself is concerned, which, of course, it does, she suffers vast loss in China, whither most of the Indian yarn is exported. In 1888 and 1889 India sent to China 101 billion pounds of cotton yarn, having a value of $814,326,750. In three years the amount of yarn increased 50 per cent., and the value nearly the same. In the year 1890 the value of Indian commerce with Europe was $441,000,000, with an export surplus of $31,090,000. With the other countries of the world, India's total commerce was $187,338,750, with an export surplus of $81,783,750. Thus, while the centre of gravity of India's foreign commerce is in Europe, the centre of gravity of her surplus export is elsewhere. The surplus is particularly great with Ceylon, Japan, and China. What is more surprising than these figures is that, spite of the heavy wheat trade just referred to, India's balance with England taken alone is even passive, very passive, as she imports from England $188,591,250, and exports thither only $146,703,750, whereas from the rest of Europe, outside of Turkey, she imports but $16,376,250, while exporting thither $89,298,750, leaving a net export of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$57,922,500. Her net exports to the silvering-using lands are singularly striking: $6,307,500 to Ceylon, $4,723,750 to Japan; $35,551,250* to China.

The jute industry, too, has of late years had enormous development in India. At the close of 1890, 160,275 spindles and 7,964 looms were devoted to this industry in that country, employing 70,000 laborers. Five hundred new looms are said to have been set up in 1891. Steam flouring mills have also been erected of late in Bombay. India would probably in any event become in time one of the great manufacturing centres of the globe, but it would, for the present, be to her advantage, could she trade freely with England, to purchase thence most of her manufactures. She would perhaps profit by the arrangement as much as would England herself.

India's active commodity balance, or, as we say, favorable balance of trade, is paid for mostly in silver, though that enormous country, which contains almost one-fifth of the world's population, trained through centuries to think of law and government as uncertain, and being, therefore, not in condition to utilize credit, absorbs enormous amounts of gold also. In 1890, 461 lacs† of rupees in gold came into the country, but only two lacs went to the mint. The entire remainder the people hoarded or made into trinkets. Even the imports of the precious metals do not fully equate the surplus of commodity imports, the remainder being made up in London council bills.

Another movement dear to tariff reformers which is mightily hindered by the rise in gold is the flow of free capital from rich countries to poor. That international commerce may be as beneficial as possible it is necessary that the most abundant resources from every quarter should be at the disposal of those in any country who are endeavoring to build up the industries in prosecuting which that country has special advantages. Incalculable is the aid which human progress has received from investments made by countries of abounding capital in less fortunate portions of the world. Such blessing takes effect at both poles of the transaction. If well placed, the loans pay richly those offering them, at the same time that the borrower countries receive a great boon. This is but the beginning. Wealth and production

* These amounts in dollars are arrived at by reckoning rupees at 37½ cents.
† A lac = 10,000.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being stimulated both in the land that makes and in that which takes the loan, each becomes a better customer for the other, furthering its prosperity still more, and so on, in ceaseless round. Now, the destruction of a par in exchange between two countries with different basal moneys clogs the play of this benign principle, making interest inordinately high in silver lands and desperately low in gold lands, each side being impoverished for lack of a service which the other would gladly render could it do so with financial safety. The would-be borrower, in Benares or Delhi, hesitates to promise any rate per cent. in gold, as he cannot tell for a month, or even a day, beforehand what such rate will soon mean in silver, wherein every item of his income is told. The would-be lender, in London, Berlin, or Paris, disinclines to let his capital go for any rate per cent. whatever expressed in silver, since, were he to do so, however high the figure might be, it might, when interest day came, mean in gold anything from 20 per cent. down to zero. It is clear that no bridge of normal and regular credit can be made to span a commercial chasm of this nature. No loans will be effected under such circumstances, till interest is so low on the gold side and so high on the other that both parties grow very rash. In other words, borrowing and lending amid difficulties so grave is no longer business but gambling.

In Mexico, as well as in India, the appreciation of gold, wrecking the old parity between gold and silver and turning foreign exchange into witchcraft, has had the same effect, of immensely stimulating domestic manufactures. The Mexican delegates at the Brussels Conference made upon this point a statement which I beg leave to reproduce:

"If silver remains in Mexico in larger quantities than hitherto, productive employment for it must, perforce, be found. Agriculture will certainly be developed, but, considering the special circumstances of the country, we think that industrial undertakings will be preferred. The production of our own manufactures will cause a proportional diminution in the consumption of many European manufactures, and will in time end by completely superseding some of them. This consequence of the increase in the currency in Mexico is already beginning to be realized. For a long time we have had, if not many, yet for the most part very important, manufactures of cotton and woollen fabrics, of paper, etc., and their number has been increasing the last few years. Recently, in October, a manufactory of cotton fabrics of all sorts was opened at Rio Blanco, near Orizava, on the Mexico & Vera Cruz Railway, the importance and the probable producing power of which may be estimated by its having cost already about 5,000,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

piastres [about $5,000,000 in silver]. Besides this noteworthy example, we often find in the newspapers accounts of the establishment of new manufactories of various kinds, also of metal foundries, some of them on a large scale, like those erected two years since at Monterey and San Luis de Potosi, to utilize our lead ores, which had been exiled from the United States by a nearly prohibitive import duty. Manufactories of soap, of Portland cement, and of many other articles have been introduced."

It is at this point that the far-sighted and patriotic among the advocates of free silver find their inspiration. Aware of the absolute necessity resting upon this country to extend its foreign markets, they would take advantage of England's folly in continuing under gold monometallism and would place the United States at the head of the silver-using group of nations, to do for them their manufacturing. "Let us break off commercial relations with Europe," they say, "if only we can establish such relations with that vast part of the world where manufactures are either non-existent or inchoate, and must grow, if at all, with difficulty; and let us create for those teeming millions all their manufactured articles, taking in return those things which they can produce so much more easily than we." When men point out the prosperity that might come to our country through the introduction of such a scheme, to ridicule them betrays no intelligence. Their thought in itself is magnificent. In declaring that there is an opportunity by the means suggested to "dish" England in the markets of the world, they are quite right. If this could be accomplished without involving us in other difficulties, it would be the finest commercial *coup d'état* ever effected since trade began. So much reason attends the notion that it seems to me sheer madness to oppose to it a policy like England's present one of stubbornly adhering to gold monometallism.

With that of the ultra-silver men falls in wonderfully the idea of reciprocity put forward by Mr. Blaine. This is very popular with those brought up to believe in protection, who yet see how badly protection handicaps us in certain directions. Were every custom-house in the land levelled and every customs officer dismissed, silver monometallism, or free silver, would still preserve protection between us and Europe, just as gold monometallism now has exactly the effect of protection between us and the silver-using world. No consistent tariff reformer can wish either of these policies to prevail. The only tariff reform that will go to the root of things, carrying out the proper theory of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

international commerce, must involve bimetallism, thus making the world, for trade purposes, into one unbroken total. A protectionist is naturally a monometallist: a silver monometallist if he wishes trade defences against Europe, a gold monometallist if he wishes commercial shelter against the rest of the world. But how a thinker who sees through and is inspired by the thought of world-commerce and the uplift of civilization inevitably consequent thereupon can desire either of these monometallisms to exist passes my wit.

The suggestion just thrown out seems to me to indicate the proper method whereby to bring the two great monetary factions of our country into working harmony. Without some sort of a compromise in the matter, we shall be for an indefinite time to come at a hopeless deadlock over our treatment of silver. The ultra-gold party can never carry the day. Neither can the ultra-silver party. Though either may win a majority for a time, too much life will be found on the other side to allow permanent victory. Let those who oppose free silver take more pains to show that they are not averse to a monetary system involving silver as full money, provided it can be so ordered as to make the basis of our trade, external and internal, perfectly solid. International bimetallism will certainly do this. We are not the vassals of the small class who live upon the interest of loaned money but produce nothing. Let influential men in the East more earnestly champion the cause of bimetallism, instead of continually casting umbrage upon it, thus showing aid and comfort to the party in England which is striving to maintain and increase the appreciation of gold. At best, doubtless, the more rabid free silver men will be intractable, but the course I recommend would break that party. Those determined not to Mexicanize the United States in respect to money would receive from the silver ranks allies enough to establish a strong and permanent hard-money majority in Congress. Let this country take an attitude against the free coinage of silver by the United States alone, but in favor of its free coinage in case all the great nations will join therein, and the bimetallists in the British Parliament will soon win the day there. The policy of all Europe will then become bimetallic, and monetary peace and prosperity be assured to the world for at least the next hundred years.

E. BENJ. ANDREWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WILD TRAITS IN TAME ANIMALS.

I.—THE HORSE.

BY DR. LOUIS ROBINSON.

ALL our tame beasts are descended from wild ancestors. Their most noteworthy characteristics are attributable to certain needs of their free life before ever straps and chains were thought of. The qualities which we find so useful were not developed in the first place for human ends. The cunning brain of man has adapted and improved them, but they were there and serving a useful purpose in the private economy of the animals before our earliest savage ancestors had learned to make knives of chipped stone.

We will give the horse the first place in the inquiry; but although others of the familiar inhabitants of our houses, farms, and fields will be passed in review in turn, it will not be possible to consider one species without taking account of others. For instance, we value the horse for his speed and endurance; yet had it not been for the chief ancestor of our faithful friend the dog, *i. e.*, the grim gray wolf of Europe and Asia, with his everlasting hunger and untiring gallop, the wild horses which swarmed over the great plains of the Old World, and from which all our modern steeds have sprung, would never have developed the swiftness and staying power they possessed and have transmitted to their descendants.

The wolves and the wild horses were constantly at war, and, moreover, the wolf was the only predatory beast existing in ancient times which was able to pursue the horses and hunt them down out on the open steppe. The galloping power of the horse was thus undoubtedly developed to enable him to escape these gaunt, persistent foes. So certain does

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this appear to me that I never see a wolf in a menagerie without feeling inclined to raise my hat to him and to thank him for many an exhilarating gallop on horseback. If his bloodthirsty forefathers had never existed, there would have been little to choose between a horse and a donkey.

It must be borne in mind that such influences were at work from day to day, from year to year, and from century to century during immense epochs before ever the first wild horse was lassoed by man. It seems strange that this long and bitter feud between the *Equidæ* and the *Canidæ* should now be almost entirely forgotten. Horses seldom show an instinctive enmity to dogs in the same way that cattle do. Probably this is because they are so closely associated together in their common state of servitude to man. The horse is an intelligent animal and readily finds out who are his friends. Probably also when wild he had little fear of a single wolf, for he has plenty of courage and is a skilful fighter with hoofs and teeth. Occasionally, however, the old dread and enmity crop up. I have known young horses, when surrounded by a pack of foxhounds for the first time, to become almost frantic with fear. My brother, who lives among the Essex Downs, and who spends much of his time on horseback, has informed me that he had often noticed when crossing the open hills at night that his mare would suddenly start and tremble and try to make a dash for home, with ears laid back and every sign of great agitation. At first he was puzzled by this, for the animal was generally quiet and tractable. At length he found that the terrifying object was usually a wandering hill-fox, which had chanced to pass near enough to be perceived either by the horse's power of scent or of vision.

Foxes, of course, are not dangerous to larger animals, but probably there is something of the wild beast about them, absent in the dog, which reminds the horses of their ancient foes. There is no doubt that when coyotes are ridden down on the prairie and killed with a bull whip or revolver at close quarters, the horses enter into the hunt with enthusiasm. They do their best to catch the wolves, and will strike at them with their hoofs if they get near enough. Darwin has recorded the remarkable fact that almost the only occasion upon which horses are known to scream with terror, when not suffering pain, is when they are at-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tacked by wolves; and Charles Kingsley, in one of his charming *Prose Idylls,* describes the conduct of his horse when a hunted fox passed near it. It laid back its ears, bared its teeth, and bit at the air in the direction of the fox. Kingsley accounted for the hostile demonstration on the part of his horse by the fact that it was an old hunter. Excellent naturalist though he was, I think he was mistaken in his conclusion on this occasion. A horse ridden after hounds seldom has a chance of seeing the object of pursuit, and probably in nine cases out of ten knows nothing about it. Certainly he could never learn enough to acquire a savage hostility to poor Reynard. Nor is there any reason why he should. The hunted fox, whether known or unknown, is to him a source of delight, for a hunter always manifests pleasurable excitement when he sees the hounds and anticipates a gallop.

We know that the horse's wild forefathers, like the free mustangs, inhabited open plains and trusted chiefly to their speed to escape from their enemies. This becomes all the more evident when we examine a young foal. All young creatures tend to resemble the earlier types from which the race has sprung, more than adults do. The legs of the foal are enormously developed from birth. He looks absurdly like a horse on stilts, and when four or five days old he can gallop almost as fast as ever he will in his life. He holds his head up boldly, and never tries to slink away and hide, like a young calf or fawn, whose ancestors dwelt in the forest. There is a story that a thoroughbred foal of about a month old once beat a racehorse over a half-mile course. His dam was a mare celebrated for her speed, and she had a jockey on her back. She outstripped the rival horse, and her long-legged offspring kept level with her with ease.

If you watch how a young colt takes his nourishment, you will see that his habits tell the same story. He never takes a full meal in the way that a young calf does, but keeps constantly running to his mother, and refreshing himself every few minutes. This shows, first, that it is not his custom to be long absent from his dam, as are young animals which lie hidden among the thickets while their parents go to seek food. It shows, secondly, that his stomach is never so loaded with a meal as to hinder his running powers, which were all-important when the youngest member of the band had to keep up with the rest in their flight from wolves or other enemies. Again, a colt, when he lies down, does not curl

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

himself up in small compass, as if to escape observation, after the bashful manner of a calf, but extends his long limbs conspicuously.

It is difficult to understand how the legs of horses stand the wear and tear of work in our great cities, where every step of their iron shod hoofs is upon a hard, unyielding road. There is no other creature living, with the exception of the donkey or the mule, which can long bear the constant battering entailed by rapid locomotion over a paved surface. But if we look at the structure of the horse's legs we see how it is that the jar and vibration do not injure him more. His "pasterns," the part just above the hoof, yield a little at each step, and so break the force of the concussion. He is, in fact, mounted on springs. This is one chief reason why he is a pleasant animal to ride. Any one who has tried riding a cow or ox has found the difference between the easy, elastic movements of the horse and the jolting and jogging of a horned mount.

Again, wild habits of ancient date further explain the fact for us. The mobs of wild horses had to travel far and fast, for dear life, over rock-strewn deserts, both when in search of food and when pursued by their hereditary foes. It was most necessary, in habitually traversing hard and stony plains for many hours at a stretch, to have strong hoofs, and legs which would both stand wear and tear and at the same time save the body from the injurious effects of the constant jar and concussion. The importance of this can be judged by those who have ridden both a cushion-tired cycle and an old-fashioned "bone-shaker." Vibration is always most exhausting to the body. The reason why a pneumatic-tired sulky is worth several seconds in the mile to a trotter is not so much because it is of lighter draught, but because practically no vibration is conveyed along the shafts and traces to the horse's body. Ever so little vibration will weary his muscles and hamper his movements to a certain extent.

I should like to discuss the questions why the horse in the wild state took to a life out in the open, and what are the other effects of such a life upon his structure, more in detail; but this would involve too many technical points. His earliest known fossil ancestor was a five-toed animal. He was by no means swift or imposing in appearance, and probably paddled about in the soft marshes during the early part of the tertiary geological epoch, much as the tapir does at the present day. Later there were huge herds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of three-toed horses abounding all the world over. It seems as if, the fewer were the toes, the better was the horse. It is quite certain that a one-toed hoofed animal is better adapted for swift progress over firm ground than one of the type of the tapir or rhinoceros.

Did the earth gradually dry up so as to give the one-toed varieties the advantage? Or did the sedgy marshes and thicket-lined streams harbor too many prowling foes, so that the early horse-like animals had to take to the open? I am inclined to think that the latter theory is the correct one. Even now most young horses resemble wild animals in being suspicious of any strange sound or object. "Shying" is most distinctly a relic of an ancestral instinct. The wild horse, swift of foot and keen of vision, feared few enemies when out on the naked plains; but every bush or tuft of long grass might, and often did, contain a fierce foe lying in ambush. Many and many a time must the wild horse have saved his life by a sudden swerve and leap in the opposite direction the moment he heard the rustle of leaves or descried some strange and dimly outlined object among the underwood.

I know several horses by no means timid or given to shying which become almost mad with terror when they hear the loud rustle of reeds by a river-bank. Yet there is no danger to be anticipated from this sound, as far as their experience goes. Their panic tells us a tale of many a tragic incident of the remote past, when the herds of wild desert steeds, parched with thirst, sought the water-courses, where was "grass with reeds and rushes," and were there pounced upon by leopards or tigers, crouching, concealed, on the watch for prey.

Every horse which is employed on the road must learn to trot, or he is of little use to his owner. Yet we find that wild prairie horses, and young colts out at pasture, seldom trot. Some naturalists have even said that this pace is entirely artificial, and has been acquired since the horse became man's captive. I need not here say anything of the wonderful perfection to which trotting has been brought by judicious breeding and training. But let us consider what was the natural raw material out of which the feats of "Maud S." and her competitors have been evolved.

On the smooth, springy turf cantering or galloping is the easiest pace; but on a hard, irregular track with rocks strewn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about, even the wild horse will trot, and lift his knees in the most approved style. So at least I have been told by those who have watched the wild "brumbies" in the mountains of Australia. The reason is not difficult to see. A horse, when he walks or trots, puts down one front foot at a time; and when the rough and treacherous nature of the ground renders careful going necessary—for a false step might mean instant death from foes or precipices—this is by far the safest method of going. The animal can choose his path better than if, as when he canters or gallops, he has to find foothold for both his front hoofs together instead of for one at a time. We find practically nowadays that for road work, trotting is the safest pace, and takes far less out of a horse than cantering. Hence, again, we see that a provision of nature for special emergencies of free equine life has been taken hold of by civilized man, and developed for his own ends.

The tractable temper of the horse we owe to the fact that he is naturally gregarious in his habits; for when many animals are associated together for common protection, an accommodating temper and a readiness to obey the leaders are most necessary virtues. Selfishness and cantankerousness would soon break up the band, and then each member would have to fight the wolves or watch for the prowling *Felidæ* single-handed. A two-year-old yields his will to that of his trainer, just as the wild colt had to "knock under" to the wily veteran which was the acknowledged leader of his mob.

The courage of the horse is doubtless attributable to his habit of waging fierce war with rivals or enemies in a state of freedom. Every one has noticed that a bad-tempered horse lays back his ears. Darwin drew attention to the fact that as horses fight largely with their teeth, the ears were in the first place pressed back to prevent their being bitten. All long-eared animals which use their teeth in battle do the same. The movement was always associated with hostile intentions, and for this reason is now so inseparable from emotions of this kind that we take the laying back of the ears as the mark of ill-temper.

The great difference between the various breeds of horses has been largely brought about by human agency; but not entirely. We find that in mountainous regions the horses are small and shaggy. All ponies are descended from those herds which chose the hills for their *habitat*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I shall have something to say in later articles upon the effect of mountain ranges in developing certain useful qualities of our domestic animals. Not long ago I saw some Hungarian mountain ponies in London, and mistook them for large Shetlanders. The resemblance was certainly very great. What is more interesting is the fact that both kinds almost exactly resemble the prehistoric European wild horse, which the early men of central France used to kill with their flint-headed arrows. We know this partly from the shape of the bones of horses found with early human remains, but also owing to the curious fact that these primitive savages were accomplished artists, and that they have left many sketches of horses scratched on reindeer horns, slate, and mammoth tusks, in the caves they used to inhabit. The horses here represented have large heads, straight, short necks, round bodies, and short legs. We know that they existed in countless herds, for at one place where the ancient horse-hunters lived, there are the bones of many thousands. They were not large animals, and there is very little doubt that we have in the Shetland and Hungarian ponies their direct descendants, with very little change produced by the admixture of Eastern blood. The race horse and most other light horses owe their origin largely to Arab and Barb importations. The great dray horses are most probably the stout European wild horses improved by constant selection and good feeding. Most of them have the appearance of overgrown ponies. The mustangs of the West are now pretty thoroughly mixed, but in the first place they were the descendants of the horses which escaped from the Spanish conquerors. These, from ancient pictures, I should judge to have been a cross between the native European horse and the African Barb.

Now there is a riddle I will leave to my readers. Every horse has on his legs certain wart-like patches of bare skin, called callosities. On the fore legs they are above the knee, and on the hind legs below the hock. They are of no use that we can discover, and no theory has ever been put forward that will account for them. But they would not be there in every horse unless they met some vital want, either in the past or present. Probably in this case they are vestiges of some ancient habit. If any one can find out what this was, he will throw an interesting light upon early equine history, and his name will become famous among naturalists all the world over.

LOUIS ROBINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE.

BY ARTHUR SILVA WHITE.

THE principles underlying the development of nationalities, the growth and expansion of nations, and the consolidation of world-power have been the same throughout the history of mankind. They are familiar to the historian or the geographer who views his subject in its political aspects as a science. And their application to the elucidation of the Present, seen through the Past, with reference to the Future, is as sure as human reasoning and forecast can ever hope to be.

The *nuclei* of civilization, formed at various epochs in the world's history, have, within the last few centuries, rapidly grown and become intermerged. The chief focus of civilization was first located, we are told, somewhere in western Asia; afterward it shifted to the Mediterranean; at the present day it is over the Atlantic, and we may reasonably assume that to-morrow, whenever that times comes, it will be centred in the Pacific. The course of empire, it has been truly said, moves ever westward. Who are its heirs to-day? Who shall be the legatees to-morrow?

The first question has been answered—Europe and America, with "poor relations" scattered over other parts of the globe. The second question has to be considered. Shall the reply be—America and Asia? Or shall the cycle of civilization, being thus completed, embrace the whole world? Personally, I think the latter alternative the more reasonable solution, for it is difficult, almost impossible, to presuppose the extinction of Europe as a leading factor in the world's politics.

Europe to-day is an armed camp; America is a base for its supplies; Asia and Africa are the fields of its rivalries. Europe, in short, overruns the world. Nations may rise and fall, but the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

domination of Europe over the other continents is assured for at least another twenty-five years. So much is certain. What, then, are the international changes likely to ensue during that period? And in how far will America participate in those changes? People in Europe speak of "America" when they mean the United States only; but by geographers the latter are regarded simply as the most important political division of a vast continent. The genius and enterprise of the "Americans" have secured for them a position in the appreciation of Europe out of all proportion to their effective strength as an independent nationality. Owing to their geographical position and lack of colonial interests, they are in a great measure "counted out" of European politics. But once the United States are consolidated as a nation, and the course of empire touches the western shores of the Atlantic, the Monroe Doctrine will fall to the ground unless it be upheld by force of arms. Did France and England respect the Papal bull that divided the world between Spain and Portugal? Can a nation become great and prosperous unless it be able to command respect for its flag in all parts of the world? These are questions that I shall endeavor to answer in another place. Meantime, what is the political situation in the Old World? The great powers of Europe are terribly crippled by the enormous armaments which, in order to insure their national security, they are forced to keep up. Between them there is a merciless competition for supremacy, which saps their strength in peace and dissipates it in war. It may be truly said that none of these powers has a genuine friend in Europe; such a luxury might involve too great a sacrifice. Yet all desire peace—or, shall we say, a truce—during which their national armaments may be strengthened? Some, with this object, form combinations; but none trusts alone to peace alliances and paper treaties. Self-interest is the only stable factor in such relationships, and in Europe, as elsewhere, every state has divergent interests. The duty of diplomacy is to make the most and the best of these ever-changing conditions. Consequently, the danger of war, the limitation of which can rarely be foreseen, is ever with us.

To Great Britain, owing to the extent of world-embracing empire, European alliances are all but impossible. She endeavors to stand alone and to rest her security on her long-existing supremacy over the sea, which unites and does not separate—so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long as her sea power is upheld—the mother-country with her colonies. In consequence of this supremacy—which, as an Englishman, I am proud to think is nowadays exercised with moderation and justice, and for the benefit of civilization—Great Britain enjoys the enviable position of being the most detested power in Europe. Nevertheless, she is not without "fair-weather friends"; no power, of such standing, could be safely neglected. Her policy, more than that of any other great power, makes for peace; since she has everything to lose and nothing to gain by the arbitrament of war. But the best guarantee of peace is, after all, the convention between the three central powers. It is true, the Triple Alliance is not so stable as it once was, owing to the impoverishment of the allies and especially of Italy; at any moment it may fall asunder. Italy, under the Marquis di Rudini, is, in fact, known to have coquetted with Russia, in anticipation of a fall. The *Kaiserbund* no longer exists; the project of a league between neutrals, though again revived, seems as remote from realization as ever: and, barring secret alliances, of which we can have no knowledge, the only other alliance between European states is that recently concluded between France and Russia. Such a combination, judged by the national tendencies of the allies, is a menace to the peace of Europe; and more especially is it directed against Great Britain. It is an accord which, in the present tension of European politics, reverberates in every court as an ominous discord. France and Russia are the most restless and aggressive of the great powers; whilst their common and hereditary enemy is Great Britain. In consequence, therefore, of this disturbance of the balance of power in Europe, we may look to the near future for the birth of epoch-making events. It seems impossible that the outbreak of hostilities can be long delayed. Experts are fairly unanimous in the belief that, should a European war break out, the British Empire would be shaken to its foundation. Perhaps it may totally collapse? And, in the event of such collapse, what would be the position of America? These are questions that statesmen are bound to consider, since no man may say that such a calamity as the break-up of the British Empire is an impossibility. Indeed, under certain circumstances, it would be inevitable. These contingencies being possible, however remote, it is our duty to examine them and, if possible, to indicate a way by which they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may be averted. And, since America must necessarily participate in the issue, for good or evil, it becomes a question of vital concern to the United States.

Supposing France and Russia were to declare war against Great Britain? It would be a maritime war, of course. The Allies would aim at the destruction of British sea-power, with the fall of which the British Empire would tumble to pieces. The French land-forces would be held in readiness to invade England in the event of the British Navy's being defeated in the English Channel. The Russian hordes would hover on the Northwest frontier of India, preparatory to a descent on that coveted land. In all parts of the world Great Britain would, moreover, have to protect her vital colonial interests and her vast sea-borne commerce.

The traditional maritime policy of France has been to prey upon British commerce; but, as Captain Mahan points out, the destruction of commerce and the interruption of supplies will not of themselves determine the main issues of a maritime campaign. Tactically, such a policy may be effective enough, and in that sense prepare the way for a naval victory; but strategically, the *guerre-de-course* may be the means of losing more than it gains. The real issues to a maritime war between the great naval powers of Europe must, of necessity, be determined in European waters. Great Britain has not troops enough with which to invade France and Russia, or even one of these powers, with any certainty of dealing them a vital blow; indeed, her only chance of undertaking effective land operations would be in becoming a party to the Triple Alliance, and thus securing the assistance of the central powers under the circumstances. Once war were declared, however, such a combination would be impossible; since none of the central powers would have cause to regret the humiliation of England. Of course it is clear that the mere fact of Great Britain's joining the Triple Alliance would of itself avert the outbreak of hostilities. France and Russia could not possibly stand against such a mighty coalition, and could depend on no other European allies. But there are strong objections against Great Britain's openly joining the Triple Alliance; moreover, her understanding with Italy as regards the Mediterranean, and with Germany and Austria as regards Europe, would appear to suffice at the present time. France and Russia pitted against

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Great Britain, alone and without allies, would have at least a reasonable chance of succeeding in their task of crippling or breaking up the empire. In the event of such a war, the neutral powers would, if possible, stand aloof, in the same way as Europe watched the Franco-German duel. The humiliation and spoliation of the British Empire might benefit them all—for a time. But I have no hesitation in saying that such a disaster would injuriously affect every unconsolidated and free nationality throughout the world. If the empire of the sea were to pass into the hands of France, the world would have to be conquered anew. The English domination may be haughty and sufficiently exasperating towards weaker nations, but what would be that of France? Moreover, France bears evidence of an arrested national development, and appears to be quite incapable of maintaining such a position, with which a fortuitous combination of events might temporarily invest her.

If the war were seen to be going against Great Britain, Germany would probably join in the issue (as against the French hegemony) if not too late to avert the worst consequences. At the same time, neither Austria nor Italy would view with equanimity the growth and expansion of Russia and France at the expense of Great Britain. So that, under the least favorable circumstances of the latter, it is evident that the total collapse of her empire is improbable; except under the inconceivable circumstances of the colonies seceding at her moment of direst peril, or of the British Navy's being rendered impotent.

Enough has been said to illustrate the statement I am now about to make: that *the welfare of the United States is bound up with the maintenance of the British Empire.* In the event of such a war as has been indicated, the United States would, no doubt, by remaining neutral, profit by the temporary transference of a portion of the world's shipping to their flag; but only the command of the sea would enable them to obtain any material and permanent advantage by the altered situation. The United States have lost most of their carrying-trade simply because of the inadequate strength of their navy; and any attempt to compete with a rival European power, other than Great Britain, for the supremacy of the sea, would involve them in responsibilities which they are at present unable to meet.

When all has been said, there is more affinity based upon a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

common language and a common origin, between the United States and Great Britain than there is between the States and any other European power. Though England, through her own fault, lost the States as an integral portion of the British Empire, their mutual interests, though involving commercial rivalry, remain radically the same. Both wish to "live and let live." And it is not too much to say that, but for this relationship, the United States might not have enjoyed the same immunity from European aggression as they have up to the present. The mother-country and her whilom colonies in America separated and agreed to live apart; but I believe that both would have deep cause to regret and would make an effort to avert a vital blow struck at their existence as great and independent states.

The subject of Imperial Federation has been widely discussed during recent years; and public opinion is fairly unanimous in the adoption of the following unassailable premises:

1. That the relations at present existing between the mother-country and the great self-governing colonies, though cordial in sentiment, form the slenderest political ties, liable to be broken on a sudden emergency. This is chiefly due to the fact that, both at home and abroad, public opinion is insufficiently educated to appreciate the value of an inviolable political union between the mother-country and the colonies. 2. That secession on the part of any one colony would be detrimental to the interests of the empire, in which all British subjects have a share. 3. That the home government, being unable to take official cognizance of a secession that is only problematical, or, in the event of such secession to prevent it, it rests with all loyal subjects of Her Majesty themselves to secure their heritage as British citizens. 4. That, both at home and in the colonies there is a growing tendency in favor of what has been popularly called "imperial federation"—or, as I prefer to style it, "Britannic confederation"—but that, hitherto, the complexity of the problem has prevented the formulation of any practical and well-considered scheme. 5. That, in brief, the consensus of opinion is against the formation of a *Zollverein*, as being at present impossible, owing to the immature development of the colonies; but that a *Kriegsverein*, or combination for mutual defence in time of war, is not only immediately practicable, but is a measure that is urgently needed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The "Imperial Federation League" still exists; but its Council and Central Executive have resigned; they maintain that the objects of the league, in obstructing public opinion, have been attained. The city branch of the league, however, proposes to carry on the propaganda on more commercial lines, whilst the West End branch, in which the executive originally reposed, intends to take up independently the subject of defence. Thus, the league, though altered in its constitution, is likely to achieve more practical results in the future. As to the colonies themselves—*i. e.*, the great self-governing colonies; since, of course, all crown dependencies are necessarily excluded from any scheme of confederation—Canada, the most advanced in political development, has boldly thrown in her lot with the British Empire, though her destiny cannot fail to be greatly affected by her contiguity to the United States; Australia is endeavoring to promote inter-federation, on free-trade lines, between the several colonies of the Australian Continent—a step that must necessarily precede Britannic confederation; New Zealand remains a staunch adherent of the Crown; while Cape Colony and Natal, though loyal, are, by reason of their mixed populations, and especially of the relatively small European contingent, scarcely prepared to take up the full citizenship of the empire. So that we see some time must elapse before a matured and workable scheme of confederation can be safely adopted. As long, however, as the colonies maintain the union and sufficiently provide for their self-defence, the British Empire has nothing to fear from any combination of hostile powers. And it seems to be beyond criticism to disprove that, only by maintaining the union, can the colonies ever hope to secure their self-preservation and independence. Canada, it is true, might unite her fortunes with those of the United States; but, by so doing, she would inevitably lose the freedom of national development and the independence of political action which she at present enjoys as a member of the British Empire; she would, in short, become absorbed into the more important and better situated States on her southern borders.

Now, those who, like myself, believe that the consolidation of the British Empire is inevitable, unless some disaster befall us within the next decade, are not content that the United States should be excluded from this world-embracing power.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some of us look with hope for a confederation of all English-speaking countries. Of course, such a union would require to be of the simplest and most flexible kind; in short, merely a combination for defence, a *Kriegsverein*. Even that is impossible, so far as the United States are concerned, at the present day. But, what is impossible now may become possible enough at a future date. Before the first quarter of the next century the United States will have become a consolidated nation. What, then, will be their position, in face of Europe and its political combinations? Who will be the great colonial powers? In whose hands will rest the supremacy of the sea? If Great Britain maintains her empire, and with it her naval supremacy, the United States, without colonies of their own and without a navy equal to that of any European power, must be satisfied to take a 'back-seat" in the councils of the world; they may become a great trading community, at the sufferance of Europe, but a great nation—never. Nor could they escape the adoption of a foreign policy, with its concomitant risks. As a member of the Britannic confederation of the future, or by whatever name it may be called, they would, on the other hand, without losing their independence or dignity, join with the English-speaking states in their pacific conquest of the world, and thrive under a reign of peace which only such a combination can insure. In a word, I do not see how it is possible for the United States, once they have reached the high level of self-contained and rigidly restricted position of a continental state, ever to become a world-power, unless they possess—as Great Britain now possesses—the appanages of empire. Besides which, their isolated position is always assailable by a stronger power.

Some of my critics may say: We Americans are satisfied with our position and prospects as they stand. Quite so; I fully believe it. But what will be your position aud prospects twenty-five years hence? That is the question I wish to ask Americans. Not being a prophet, the most I can do is to indicate, in a general way, what the position and prospects of the United States may be in, say, 1925. I have already vaguely referred to these; but, there is another matter, upon which too great stress cannot be laid; namely, the opening of the Nicaragua Canal. So soon as it becomes possible for large ships to pass the Central American isthmus, either through the Nicaragua Canal or by another route,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world's commerce will be revolutionized. The displacement of commercial centres and the alteration of trade-routes which followed the opening of the Suez Canal will be re-enacted, on a vastly greater scale, and in a manner peculiarly vital to America, when once the Isthmus of Panama ceases to oppose obstacles to shipping. The United States will then dominate one of the chief *foci* of the world's commerce, and it will rest with them to make or mar their future prosperity. Their international isolation will thus become impossible. But, without a naval establishment equal to its responsibilities, the United States cannot hope to wrest the carrying-trade or foreign commerce from those who now enjoy these perquisites. On the other hand, their eastern States will be brought very near to the western states of South America, and they will thereby be enabled to compete successfully with European exports to those markets. That South America will be left alone to "stew in its own juice," is not at all likely.

Since, with a nation as with an individual, no limit can be set to self-aggrandisement, beyond that imposed by capacity, it rests with the United States either to attain a high position among the nations of the world or to be satisfied with a relatively low one. In order to achieve the former, the United States must either throw in their lot with the greatest colonial power of the times or be in a position to subsequently supplant it. Vast as are their territories, the day must come when the United States will have a surplus population or when the exigencies of commerce will call for the command of foreign markets. If, therefore, these markets and new fields of expansion can be obtained pacifically and cheaply, it is obviously to the advantage of the United States thus to secure them, rather than to rest their future prosperity on the chances of war and of political catastrophies.

A political union between the United States and the British Empire being at present impossible, there remains but one expedient—an alliance, or accord, which would pave the way to concerted action in the future. This alliance need not be of sufficient intimacy to involve the United States in any responsibility as regards British interests in all parts of the world. It is obvious that, in their present undeveloped condition, the United States dare not risk becoming involved in a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European war. Their desire is to remain neutral; and the alliance I am about to propose provides for their strict neutrality, in the terms of international law. If I were asked to draft the terms of an Anglo-American alliance, or accord, I should put it in this way:

Great Britain shall become an ally of the United States in the event of any European power or powers declaring war against the latter. On the other hand, the United States shall guarantee friendly neutrality in the event of Great Britain becoming involved in a war with one or more of the European powers concerning issues that in no way concern the pacific interests of the United States; and, under such circumstances, the United States shall render to Great Britain every assistance, positive and negative, allowed to neutrals.

The United States would thereby secure a guarantee of safety against foreign aggression or invasion; whilst all that they would be called upon to give, in return for this inestimable advantage, would be their goodwill towards the British Empire. In this way Great Britain would improve her means of communication and supplies. Ultimately it might lead to a defensive alliance. To a naval power like Great Britain, it would be of immense advantage to secure a friendly, neutral base on the Atlantic and Pacific shores of the United States; the more so, if such assistance were refused to the powers with whom Great Britain might be at war. Every neutral has sympathies and is in a position to render valuable, though legitimate, aid to a belligerent; and it does not seem too much to ask that, other things being equal, the United States should assist their own cousins rather than outsiders. Nothing but positive ill-will could inspire any other policy towards Great Britain; but, it is tolerably certain, that the active good-will I should like to see existing between them can by no means be reckoned upon. It is for this reason that I venture to urge the adoption of a distinct Anglo-American alliance.

ARTHUR SILVA WHITE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW WE RESTRICT IMMIGRATION.

BY DR. JOSEPH H. SENNER, UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION.

IMMIGRATION has practically come to a standstill. We have to look back beyond the year 1880 to find figures so low as those for the months of January and February, 1894. If we take into consideration the unprecedented number of emigrants from the United States to Europe since August, 1893, and the fact that an exceedingly large portion of all the recent immigrants has consisted of mere relatives (members of the same family) of residents of this country, we may well state that immigration has substantially ceased. A good deal has been said of recent years about the supposedly all-deciding influence of the great steamship trade on immigration. Many members of our legislative bodies actually believed, or pretended to believe, that it was the avarice of the steamship magnates and of their agents which almost exclusively created immigration, and that it needed only a severe "pounding" of the creators of the evil to abolish it once for all. The eagerness of the steamship companies to earn money has certainly not lessened in these times of forced depression and unavoidable losses in business. No doubt their agents work harder than ever to earn commissions. And yet we find an immigration equal to naught, and, if advance reports prove to be as correct an indication as usual of the prospects for this year, it bids fair to be one of the poorest in immigration since 1856. The traffic in prepaid tickets, which for many years past has represented about 50 per cent. of all the sales, has been wiped out of existence. Our foreign-born residents are themselves too deeply engaged in the hardest struggle for life to spare money to pay the passage of their European relatives or friends, or to assist them to earn a living. Their letters to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

old fatherland are no longer filled with the spirit of bragging, so common among newcomers who have exchanged a life of deprivation for a civilized standard and for the prospects of healthy prosperity. Such glowing letters, the very best and in fact the only efficient immigration agents, are replaced by tales of woe not much less heart-rending than those told by the European kinsfolk and friends, and certainly much more sad and impressive because unexpected. To make matters worse, an unprecedentedly large number of would-be Americans returning to Europe have additional and aggravated tales of woe to relate. Whether they have returned voluntarily among the tens of thousands who since August, 1893, have given up the hope of finding an Eldorado on this side of the Atlantic, or whether they have been forced to return by the watchful gatekeepers of the United States as undesirable, they become in either case anti-immigration agents of the most effective type. Not even the enactment of the sternest statute, could be more restrictive of immigration than these natural regulators of the ebb and flow in the tide of aliens.

To substantiate these general remarks by telling figures, I present a table of immigration at the port of New York during the winter months, October, November, December, January, and February, of 1893–94, compared with the same months of 1890–91 and 1891–92. The winter of 1892–93 does not admit of fair comparison, on account of the cholera scare and the enforced stoppage of immigration. Nevertheless, its immigration, during the five months mentioned, exceeded that of last year's corresponding period by 2,777:

	1890-91.	1891-92.	1893-94.
October	31,434	36,798	15,466
November	30,590	28,019	12,345
December	17,048	20,116	11,415
January	11,092	13,761	5,578
February	15,377	20,882	6,841
Total for five months	105,541	119,576	51,645

Immigration to the other ports of entry has, I am told, diminished by a still larger percentage. As far as results go, therefore, the first year's enforcement of the last immigration law (the act of March 3, 1893), under a Democratic administration, has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proved beyond doubt a great success as a restrictive measure. But no one, however intimately he may be connected with the framing or the enforcement of this and the other immigration laws, is or will claim to be entitled to credit for the result attained, which under existing conditions is certainly all that could be wished for. These conditions, only too well known to every suffering American, have unquestionably done the most, but the provisions of the last act, and the enforcement of them, have done not a little to bring about the desired result. And as the law of March 3, 1893, was avowedly of a tentative character, it is very interesting to review its practical working during its lifetime of a little more than nine months.

The act "to facilitate the enforcement of the immigration and contract labor laws of the United States," approved March 3, 1893, took effect, as to vessels departing from foreign ports for ports within the United States, after sixty days from the passage of the act, *i. e.*, after the 2d of May, 1893. It did not enlarge the category of excluded persons. Its provisions were but additional to those of the laws of March 3, 1875, August 3, 1882, February 26, 1885, March 23, 1887, October 19, 1885, and March 3, 1891, and related principally to the duties of the steamship companies and the manner of examining and inspecting passengers. Since its passage, as before, the excluded classes consist only of idiots, the insane, paupers or persons likely to become a public charge, persons suffering from a loathsome or a dangerous contagious disease, persons convicted of a felony or other infamous crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude (expressly saving those convicted of a political offence), polygamists, and finally contract laborers, who, with some minor exceptions, are absolutely excluded, as well as all assisted immigrants, unless it be affirmatively and satisfactorily shown, on special inquiry, that they do not belong to one of the excluded classes. But while there is no change in the excluded classes, there is a notable and most beneficial improvement in the methods provided for their detection.

First of all, the steamship companies have been forced to initiate the process, before embarkation, of winnowing the immigrants. Their manifests, which must be sworn to by the master or commanding officer and by the surgeon of the vessel, before the United States consul at the port of departure, are required to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state, as to each and every immigrant, the full name, age, and sex, whether married or single; the calling or occupation; whether able to read or write; the nationality; the last residence; the seaport for landing in the United States; the final destination, if any, beyond the seaport of landing; whether having a ticket through to such final destination; whether the immigrant has paid his own passage, or whether it has been paid by other persons or by any corporation, society, municipality, or government; whether in possession of money, and, if so, whether upwards of $30, and how much if $30 or less; whether going to join a relative, and, if so, what relative, and his name and address; whether ever before in the United States, and, if so, when and where; whether ever in prison or almshouse or supported by charity; whether a polygamist; whether under contract, express or implied, to perform labor in the United States; and what is the immigrant's condition of health mentally and physically, and whether deformed or crippled, and, if so, from what cause.*

The very nature and the number of these questions, the answer to which is to be sworn to by responsible representatives of the steamship company as correct and true to the best of their knowledge and belief, enforce a hitherto unknown examination of the immigrants before embarkation. Any violation of this law exposes the steamship company to heavy fines and, besides, to the quite large expense of maintaining the immigrants during the period of inspection and special inquiry, and of returning the debarred to the nation whence he came. Moreover, those unlawfully landed must be likewise returned, at any time within one year, at the expense of the steamship company; and a person who becomes a public charge within one year after his arrival, from causes existing prior to his landing, is deemed to have come in violation of the law. It may be said, to the credit of the steamship companies, that they have gracefully submitted to all the requirements of the law and to the stringent regulations issued by Secretary Carlisle, and that, as a rule, they have earnestly endeavored to carry out the law, not only in the letter, but also in the spirit. Numerous inquiries filed at Ellis Island from would-be immigrants or their American friends furnish clear evidence of the unwillingness of the

* Before the last law went into effect, the officers of the vessel had only to report the name, nationality, last residence, and destination of all aliens.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

steamship companies to assume the risk of transporting any immigrants likely to be excluded. It is certain that at least the first part of the process of assorting immigrants, the preliminary examination by the steamship companies before embarkation, has proved sufficient to keep out the most flagrant cases of undesirability, and to furnish a fair working basis for the second and more efficient part of the winnowing process, that conducted by the Federal inspection officers. And it is here, at this second stage of sifting, where the new law has introduced some important additions to and improvements upon the old methods of inspection, which had become very nearly a mere matter of census-taking. By a very simple and practical system of grouping and labelling the immigrants, it is made possible to identify each and every one of them. The inspection officers ars obliged to put all the questions above enumerated anew to the immigrant, and to compare his oral statements with the written evidence before them. Every person who may not appear to the inspection officers to be clearly and beyond doubt entitled to admission must be detained for a "special inquiry," to be conducted by not less than four officials acting as a board of inspectors; and no immigrant can be admitted upon special inquiry except after a favorable decision made by at least three of said inspectors. To what extent this novel institution has been carried into operation on Ellis Island may be best judged by the plain fact that, up to March 1, not less than 7,367 cases have been brought before the Board of Special Inquiry, who, at 792 sessions, not seldom after repeated rehearings, admitted 5,714, and excluded 1,653, immigrants. An additional safeguard in the nation's interest was established by granting to any dissenting inspector the right of appeal from a decision to admit, while under the old law only decisions adverse to the right of the alien to land were subject to appeal. To further protect our country against the influx of paupers, the new law provided that no bond or guaranty, written or oral, that an alien immigrant shall not become a public charge should be received from any person, corporation, or society, unless authority to receive the same should in each special case have been given by the Superintendent of Immigration, with the written approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. No inspection officer, not even the Board of Special Inquiry, is, therefore, now competent to accept assurances of friends, or even relatives, of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an immigrant that he will be taken care of, as sufficient basis for admittance.

It is obvious that government officials, who are faithful, conscientious, and sagacious as well, are sufficiently enabled by the provisions of the latest immigration law to protect this country from an influx of any considerable number of undesirable immigrants, without excluding desirable and welcome additions to our population. Especially the clause referring to "persons likely to become a public charge" affords ample and broad opportunity to use the greatest discretion and good judgment not only as to the individual seeking admission, but also bearing in mind the general conditions of the country. The decisions of the Federal officers in charge of this important branch of the public service must necessarily be guided, in a country like ours, by careful consideration of all the general and special circumstances of each case. Whether or not the present officers perform their arduous and responsible duties to the full satisfaction of the nation it is not for me to pass upon. But of one thing I am sure: the United States Bureau of Immigration in Washington, under its circumspect and broad-minded chief, is not only fully alive to the great responsibility resting upon the gatekeepers of the country, but endeavors earnestly to imbue all its agents, from New York and Halifax to San Francisco and Victoria, with a spirit equal to the momentous duties devolving upon them.

DR. J. H. SENNER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SUPPRESSION OF LAWLESSNESS IN THE SOUTH.

BY THE HON. J. M. STONE, GOVERNOR OF MISSISSIPPI.

THE title of this article implies that the Southern States present conditions differing from those of other sections of the United States, and requiring remedial treatment of a special or extraordinary character. There is an element of truth in this idea, but a correct and comprehensive understanding of the subject requires careful and exact discrimination. It is true that the presence of the negro race in large numbers in the Southern States is a fact that distinguishes, in many ways, the conditions of society in those States from those of Northern communities. It is very far from true, however, that extraordinary or peculiar remedies are required or would prove useful or efficacious. On the contrary the elements of ignorance and immorality that tend to lawlessness in the South are not different in quality from those existing elsewhere, though they are more extensive and prevalent, in a relative point of view, when compared with communities with exclusively white populations.

The white race of the South has the same general and fundamental moral and intellectual qualities, and the same racial instincts and characteristics, that distinguish the race elsewhere. The subject of organized society, public morality and good government, as well as the principles that regulate private obligations and duties, are unquestionably regarded by the best classes of white people in the South as they are accepted and regarded by the people in the other States. And moreover, the better class of negroes in the South share with their white fellow-citizens the desire for the moral as well as the material improvement and advancement of our commonwealths.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The elements of ignorance and illiteracy, with an accompanying low standard of morality, prevailing widely among the negro population in the South, constitute in the broadest sense the only peculiar and abnormal features that characterize the existing situation in the Southern States. While these circumstances, complicated by the friction of race prejudice, *prima facie* seem to call for special methods of treatment, and new or novel remedies, yet after careful examination and reflection, and upon an exact and thoughtful analysis, the evident impracticability, in our form of government, of heroic or empirical legal measures for the suppression of individual crimes resolves the problem at last into one that must be dealt with by ordinary legal remedies and moral forces necessarily involving a slow and tedious process.

In view of the former condition of slavery, the negroes of the South, since their emancipation, have done well, and all that could have been expected, in the direction of moral and mental advancement; but a vast deal remains to be done. The important and practical question that now presents itself is, What measures and remedies are best adapted to the solution of the problem of bringing the races into more harmonious relations, and for continuing the improvement that is now slowly going on?

The negro question, the race question, or the Southern question, as it has been indifferently termed, has been voluminously discussed from every point of view. The best thought of the country has been directed to its solution or adjustment, but the inquiry has always proceeded upon the fallacious assumption that a satisfactory result could only be accomplished by artificial, legal, or force methods; whereas it is continually becoming clearer that the problem is too complicated and the environment by far too ramified and intricate for drastic or rapid treatment, and that we must be content to wait patiently and hopefully the slow but certain operation of those great moral forces and principles that underlie our social structure, and that uniformly direct human actions in the greatest concerns of races and peoples. It seems now to be the consensus of public thought and opinion on this subject that external interference cannot possibly promote the solution of this Southern problem or lessen its tension, and that at last it must be left in the hands of the communities immediately and directly concerned in its settlement and adjustment. It is not, however, within the purpose of this paper to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discuss the political phases of this question, but only to consider the fact of political and race antagonisms in their relations to the commission and suppression of crime.

The white race of the South, charged as it is with the responsibility of government in the Southern States, has accepted the responsibility, which was unavoidable, of dealing with this race issue with all that is involved in it. The measure of this trust is correctly appreciated, and its difficulties are not underestimated, nor can either of these considerations be disregarded when it is remembered that the white men of the South, above all others, are vitally concerned in the just and proper accomplishment of this task. This consideration stands as a guaranty of our earnest purpose to secure the prosperity and welfare of these Southern communities; a consummation which involves necessarily the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals of both races, resting firmly upon a broad and just basis.

While these generalities apply broadly and in a general sense to the Southern States, the observations I shall now make are directed exclusively to the State of Mississippi.

Racial antagonisms between the whites and blacks have been a serious disturbing element, and have impaired, in a measure, the proper administration of the criminal laws in this State. The inharmonious relations between the races are due very largely to political causes which, happily, are rapidly diminishing under the operation of the suffrage clause of the State constitution of 1890, which places an educational qualification upon the elective franchise. Instead of the enormous negro majorities that formerly existed, there is now in the State a large majority of white electors, and the apprehensions and uneasiness in respect to the former ignorant and incompetent mass of voters have disappeared, and public disorders and disturbances, and the various forms of lawlessness having their origin in political causes, have ceased to occur, and there is no reasonable apprehension of their reappearance.

Notwithstanding the great modification or removal of the political tension, there remains a great mass of ignorance and illiteracy accompanied by a low standard of morality among the negro population, and there also remain the prejudices of race and caste which operate as an irritant, and which obstruct and impair, in a measure, the perfectly just and impartial administration of the criminal jurisprudence of the State. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

criminal laws of the State are perfectly just, and entirely equal and impartial in all their terms, in respect to the two races; and the judges, without exception, in their rulings and decisions, act with impartiality, though the verdicts of the juries in criminal cases are not always responsive to the justice of the case. Offences against property are not more numerous in Mississippi than in other States, and the civil laws in respect to private property rights are generally administered by the courts and juries with justice and impartiality between the races. It may be fairly asserted that property and property rights of every kind are generally protected as effectually as in other States, and a healthy public opinion prevails in the State in respect to this subject, and public sentiment is steadily advancing to a higher appreciation of the value of human life.

Conflicts between the races have happily ceased to occur. A far better feeling prevails between the whites and the blacks, and a just recognition of personal rights is gradually but steadily suppressing a former spirit of lawlessness. I can perceive no reason why, under the continued and steady pressure of this improving public sentiment, the race question should not gradually and finally cease to operate upon or affect the administration of the criminal laws of the State. When the magnitude of the upheaval of the social and political elements of the South that followed the emancipation and political enfranchisement of the slave population is considered, and the turbulence, public disorders, and bloodshed that unhappily marked the period of reconstruction is remembered, the present condition of public affairs in Mississippi is far from unsatisfactory. As the result of these periods of disorder, there naturally followed a marked increase of crimes of a homicidal nature, as is shown by the statistics of the State Penitentiary. Thus in the year 1879, in a prison population of 997, there were 247 convicts under sentence for murder, manslaughter, and homicidal assaults. In 1881 the total number of convicts was 876, and the number of this class of crimes was 237. Again in 1883, in a total of 763, there were 205 cases of this class. The following later statistics indicate the persistent continuance of this form of crime. Thus in the year 1890, in a prison population of 485, there were in the aggregate 219 convicts under sentence of imprisonment for murder, manslaughter, and homi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cidal assault. In the year 1891, in a total of 543 convicts, 268 were under sentence for these crimes. In the year 1892, in a total of 601, there were 272 convicts sentenced for these crimes; while in 1893 the total prison population was 767, with 334 convicts under sentence for these homicidal offences. The white and black convicts are shown in the following proportions: In the year 1890, whites 50, and negroes 435; in 1891, whites 54, negroes 489; in 1892, whites 47, and negroes 533; in 1893, whites 120, while there were 647 negro convicts.

During the year 1893, as shown by the records of the Supreme Court of the State, there were appeals from convictions in twenty-six murder cases, ten of manslaughter and nine of homicidal assaults, making a total of forty-five convictions by juries for homicidal offences which were reviewed by the Supreme Court. Of the murder cases nine were convictions of white men, and in the manslaughter cases one-half were white offenders. The proportion or percentage of crime is very much larger with the negroes than the whites, as will appear from the relative population of the two races. The whole population of the State, as shown by the Census of 1890, is 1,289,600, of which 544,851 are whites, and 747,749 are negroes. The relative proportions of crime show one negro convict for every 1,155 of negro population, and one white convict to every 4,540 of white population.

The period embracing the years 1875 and 1876, and perhaps 1877, exhibited a high percentage of crime. The State-prison register of the year 1877 showed a total of 1,012 convicts in the state prison, and in the year 1878 the number had increased to 1,056, the blacks largely predominating. In October, 1893, the date of the last prison report, the total number of convicts was 767. This decrease in the prison population indicates a decrease in crime, and the increase in the number of white convicts from 50 in the year 1890, to 120 in the year 1893, in my judgment, is an evidence that the law is being more effectually enforced against white offenders. Both of these indications are unquestionably in the right direction.

During what is commonly known as the reconstruction period of the South, there were in many localities semi-political organizations illegal in their character, and within the past two or three years there have appeared in a few localities in the State certain lawless organizations known as "White Caps," hav-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing in view the purposes of self-constituted vigilance committees, but not political in their character. By the ordinary methods of criminal procedure, these organizations have been completely broken up by the indictment, conviction, and punishment of numbers of the offenders. With the extermination of "White-capism" there is now no form of organized lawlessness existing in the State. Whatever of lawlessness exists here is confined to the acts of individuals, proceeding from the ordinary motives and purposes that impel individuals to violate the laws of the land.

There are occasional instances of lynching of negroes charged with the offence of criminal assault upon white women. But the instinct that prompts this form of lawlessness is not peculiar to the white race of the South, though for obvious reasons it is more frequent than in the Northern States. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that lynching is not the exception, for the prison reports show that for the year 1890 there were thirty-one convicts under sentence for this crime; in 1891 there were twenty-eight under like sentence; in 1892 there were twenty-five of such convicts; and in 1893 there were twenty-seven convicts under sentence for this crime. These statistics show clearly that ordinarily the law takes its proper course in the punishment of this most infamous of crimes, and that the lynching of the offenders is the exception, and not the rule.

The complete eradication of what is commonly termed lynch law, especially in this class of offences, has been found in all the States of the American Union a difficult, if not an impossible, task. It is obviously more difficult of treatment in the large negro populations of the South than in white communities. The death penalty has been imposed by the statutes of the State for this offence, and under the influence of this penalty I think there has been a decrease in the commission of this crime, and as the effect of an improving public sentiment there is a more general disposition to leave the trial and punishment of this class of offenders to the courts of the State. The remedies to be applied and the agencies to be employed in effecting a still further improvement in the enforcement of the law and the suppression of crime must flow naturally from the great moral forces that underlie our civilization. As the negro advances in intelligence his conceptions of the duties of citizenship will improve, and he will more distinctly and clearly perceive the duty of all members of society to obey

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the laws of the state. It is not above his comprehension to understand that his welfare and immunity from punishment, not to speak of his prosperity and advancement, depend upon his observance of the rights of others. He is steadily learning this lesson. On the other hand it is becoming clearer to the white race, that the highest condition of prosperity and improvement must finally rest upon a condition or basis involving the prosperity and contentment of the negroes, who form the great body of peasantry in the Southern States, for no country can be great or prosperous with an oppressed and discontented peasantry.

Mississippi, out of its slender resources, is spending over a million and a half dollars annually in public education, and educational facilities are provided for all the children of the State. Negro illiteracy is decreasing, and if the common-school system of public education is a potent agency in the suppression of crime, satisfactory results from this source may be confidently anticipated. Education of public thought finds its way quickly into the jury box, and improves the quality of verdicts in the just and impartial enforcement of the criminal laws. In a limited way, and as incidental to the main purpose, the technicalities of criminal law by which the guilty sometimes escape, and the delays of criminal procedure so favorable to the law-breakers, might be remedied, and a better jury system might be provided.

The white men of the South have dealt with those formidable conditions substantially as any other white men would have done. It may be fairly claimed for them that they have accomplished as much as any others in their place would have accomplished, and it may be conceded that they have probably committed as many errors. As it is, they have done their best, and the present condition of improvement is not unsatisfactory, in view of the magnitude of the undertaking. The most gratifying feature in the situation is that the trend of public thought and action is steadily in the direction of justice and fair dealing, while there is nothing in view to indicate retrogression. On the contrary, everything promises a continuance of the improvement in the relations between the races and the continued moral and material advancement of the people.

J. M. STONE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

DELICACY, TRUE AND FALSE.

THE outcry which has been raised by some persons in Boston against the bas-relief on the façade of the new Public Library Building, as an offence against decency, tempts us to consider the question, What is true delicacy, and what is false? It seems that Mr. Kenyon Cox, of New York, has produced, at the request of the Trustees of the Library, a seal which St. Gaudens, the sculptor, has carved in stone, and which many men of taste regard as heraldic, distinctive, and beautiful. This seal is a shield which, bearing an open book and resting on a pedestal, is supported by two little naked boys, each holding a long torch. At their feet are two twisting dolphins, to signify the maritime importance of Boston. Over this is the motto, "Omnium lux civium." Is there anything indelicate in this, except to a "prurient prude"? If there is what shall we say of the naked boys in Raphael's paintings and those of other old masters, and in the statuary of all the galleries of Europe? Why, again, is there no outcry against the scores of nude statues in the Boston Art-Museum?

What is true delicacy, and what is false? It is common to speak of our age as one of refinement. No doubt we are separated by a gulf of restraints and scruples fro m the coarseness of former centuries,—centuries when a lady of rank bantered Congreve across the pit of a theatre in phrases which shock us to-day; when a Duchess of Northumberland accepted the dedication of a novel fit to be read only by the creatures of a brothel; and when Young destroyed the notes of Lady Mary Wortley as too gross for print. But when persons to-day boast of their "refinement," what is it that they mean? Do they mean by the word true purity of mind reflected in the conduct, language, and manners, or do they mean only fastidiousness? It has been justly said that refinement, like modesty, consists in negatives. It is not self-conscious, coarse, or impure. This unconsciousness is a safeguard from contamination and suspicion; so that in no age is individual refinement impossible.

True refinement is slow to suspect evil. It interprets what it sees on the principles of charity. A man is not more refined than another because he suspects the loaf he eats, and assumes, therefore, that the kneader was a dirty fellow. On the contrary, refinement, being clean itself, thinks that others are clean also, until forcibly undeceived. The "father of poetry," barbarous as we deem the age in which he lived, has keenly discriminated between true and mock delicacy. When, in the Odyssey, the Princess Nausicaa and her maids are washing their garments in the river, and the naked, shipwrecked mariner appears as a suppliant before them, they act precisely as a high-bred princess and her half-bred maids would act to-day. The one,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with real dignity, listens to his supplications and relieves his necessities, while the others run screaming away.

Byron once said that the more delicate people become in words, the less so they are in acts; and Addison complained that, in his day, the more polish people got by social privilege, the more prone they were to language which "a clown would blush to hear." It is only the meretricious and wanton mind that is over-nice and squeamish in its choice of words, for the simple reason that it seeks the daintiest garment of language in which to veil its moral impurity. True delicacy, on the other hand, is never for a moment perplexed to find proper terms to express itself in, because it *thinks* no impropriety. For it to think, is to give utterance to its thoughts; and to feel, is to give expression to its emotions, with a guileless simplicity, unsuspicious of ill-natured misrepresentation, and fearless, because unconscious of the possibility, of misconstruction.

There are some persons of exceeding refinement in their own estimation, whose delicacy, of which they make a great parade, is only a delicacy, and a false one at that, in words. It is of that spurious kind which abhors plain noun substantives, and would hide its improper imaginings in studied circumlocutions. If a word has two meanings it is sensitively conscious of the worst one, and is shocked at its utterance as if the better meaning could not have been intended. It was a lady with this mock delicacy—the forerunner of those of a later day that are said to have "pantaletted" the legs (or rather, as they would have said, "the limbs") of their pianos, and to have woven aprons to cover the nakedness of marble Cupids and Psyches—who, after the publication of Johnson's dictionary, wrote to the author complaining of the naughty words he had put into it, and drew from him the cutting sarcasm, "So you have been looking for them, it seems!" When Boswell asked the doctor, as they were standing in front of a classic nude statue, "Do you not think this statue is indecent?" he bluntly replied: "No; but I think your remark is." When a man boasts of his refinement, he shows by that very act that he is not refined, but only fastidious. It was such persons that Swift satirized in one of his acutest epigrams, when he said that "nice persons are persons of nasty ideas." The Dardani, we are told, washed but thrice in their lives—when they were born, when they married, and when they died. Had they suddenly learned the necessity of frequent ablution, can one doubt that they would have been constantly talking of it? To a prurient mind the language must have many immodest words, for such are associated in great numbers to such a mind with its habitual train of thought. Such words will be avoided, while the things they denote will be thought of with pleasure.

The daughter of Macklin, the famous English actor, died of a slight injury to her knee, which she allowed to grow mortal rather than permit any doctor to look at the suffering place, though she had won her success on the stage by appearing constantly in parts which compelled the most liberal display of form and limbs. "I know an actress," says the veteran actor John Gilbert, "who won't say her lines, 'I've nearly run my legs off,' but must say, 'limbs.' Yet she will cover these same legs with nothing but thin silk tights and show them to hundreds of men every night."

It is curious to trace the history of certain words which were once in repute, but which increasing refinement, or rather fastidiousness, has banished from people's lips. The word "sweetheart" has gone wholly out of polite use, though we have no term to supply its place. Another word,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

once familiar enough, but now proscribed, and which De Quincy indicates by a Latin synonym, may be found in the following passage from Addison's *Spectator*: "'I have read over the whole sentence,' says I, 'but I look upon the parenthesis in the belly of it to be the most dangerous part.'" There are times when the word in question, which the "Opium-Eater" would replace by "stomach," is the only one adequate to the occasion. Some forty years ago Whittier wrote thus:

> "A king lies dead, his wafer duly eaten,
> His gold-bought masses given;
> And Rome's great altar smokes with gums to sweeten
> A name that stinks to heaven."

The verb in the last line offended the delicate nostrils of a Boston editor, and he proposed to emasculate the entire strength of the indignant verse by substituting "reeks" for its vulgar synonym, but it was said in reply that a thing may reek to heaven, and yet not stink to heaven, and that the latter was true of the King of Naples's name, which all the rose-water in flunkeydom could not sweeten. What right-minded person does not hold in far higher respect the outspoken honesty and truthfulness of the New England poet which prompted him to call things by their right names than the fastidiousness which led the editor of an "expurgated" edition of Shakespeare, to substitute "stomach" for "belly" some ten times in *Coriolanus* (in the fable of the belly and the members)? This editor must have been shocked at Paul's indelicacy in speaking of "men whose god is their *belly*."

Englishmen are generally supposed to have less false delicacy than Americans; but a London journal accounts for the languishing state of sculpture in England by the prudery prevailing there, which stands like a phantom on the threshhold of the sculptor's studio and scares away patronage. Proficiency in the plastic art cannot be obtained without indefatigable study of the human figure, and corresponding attention to the study of the nude; and that study is either avowedly or half unconsciously held in horror by multitudes of highly respectable people. Who has forgotten the famous protest of the bishops against the casts from the antique at the Crystal Palace? Far different was the sentiment of one of the acutest of British critics, William Hazlitt, who asserts that it is only when there is nothing but the naked figure that the display of it is offensive. "In proportion as the beauty or perfection of the imitation rises, the indecency vanishes." Northcote, the painter, in his conversations with Hazlitt, maintains the same opinion. Of Guido's "Venus attired by the Graces," he says: "None but the most vicious can find fault with it—the very beauty, elegance, and grace keep down instead of exciting improper ideas;" and again, of both this picture and the "Andromeda chained to the rock," he says: "There is no possible offence to be taken at them; nothing to shock the most timid or innocent, because there was no particle of grossness in the painter's mind. I have seen pictures by others, muffled up to the chin, that had twenty times as much vice in them. The intention will always peep out; you do not communicate a disease if you are not infected with it yourself." Just and weighty words, in which are condensed the whole philosophy of the subject! The mere quality of thorough and absolute sincerity of artistic purpose diffuses a charm over a painter's or sculptor's work, and steeps it in an atmosphere of art, which is practically a safeguard against every corrupting influence. The man who finds his imagi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation debauched after looking at a masterpiece of Raphael or Angelo may be sure that the mischief was already done before he felt the necromancy of these great magicians of the pencil and the chisel.

WILLIAM MATHEWS, LL. D.

COLLEGE THEATRICALS—AS WE HAVE THEM.

COLLEGE theatricals appear to be among the good things that soon will have attained a "commonness" and an irreclaimable mischievousness that cannot be longer ignored. Such has been the fate at least of the most conspicuous college theatricals in the United States, particularly in such large cities as Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and so on.

To a Greek tragedy or comedy, or a fling at Terence or Plautus, or English classic, by college students, nobody need object. From time immemorial theatricals of such sort have been university prerogatives. Indeed, much is owed to the antique practice. It can go on *in sæcula sæculorum* without undue interruption to undergraduate work in term-time. Much less need it bring any interference to growth of a college boy in manliness of mind and body. Such college play-acting need not be stupid. It cannot be other than dignified, highly artistic and enjoyable.

But can our college presidents, professors, trustees, parents, or guardians establish a connection worth considering between this student-like and manly phase of university theatricals and those entertainments to which the general public has been treated recently by prominent college clubs. A trivial operetta, little above the level of a music-hall burlesque, is secured by the club from somewhere, and often with the understanding that as "professionally" excellent a performance shall be offered as is practicable. The cast for it is made up with the inclusion, not merely of undergraduates, but of young men who are either past their graduation or who may have had no sufficient connection with the college. During the most necessary and vital portion of the college year, rehearsals are held weekly, daily, twice a day, as the rush of preparing advances. Now and then is convenient a certain *sub-rosa* employment of Sunday, truly "professional." Study goes by the board, except just so much study as will serve to carry a lad through his classes. Examinations must be met as best they can. Is not our collegian too busy learning his lines, his music, his "steps" in the dances, his "business" generally? He comes home at night fagged, excited, tired. He learns not his mathematics or languages. Instead he realizes the grind of the stage and its severities on head and body. In place of athletics he studies how to show his leg in a galliard and cut a high caper that would satisfy Sir Toby Belch.

Presently comes the public—not performance, but series of performances. They occur in some well-known theatre, with much advertisement. All the town, fashionable or unfashionable, is begged to come and behold a performance that cannot possibly be well achieved by the actors. In its intrinsic vapidity and sheer silliness it is not worthy giving at all. Thoughtless parents and friends are delighted to crowd to the show and to gild it with the glitter of society's approval. This or that fashionable charity of the great city is occasionally announced as its beneficiary. Finally, after the dancing and singing of the week is over, comes the last touch of a truly "professional" per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formance of the burlesque. We have a very tolerable semblance to a tour "on the road," with suburban representations here and there. With about half the college year occupied in the preparation of one of these engrossing entertainments, and its repetitions, and with the other half given to another one and its series, it is not easy to discover how any college can exert its measure of mental, moral, and physical influence on a young man.

Nor is this all that is decidedly amiss in college-theatricals as we have them. The present theatrical pieces most in vogue among our colleges bring on the stage the young American man put into short skirts or long skirts; made "pretty" as a girl, except in regard to proportions of face and figure, where indignant Nature refuses to help the unlovely metamorphosis. These modern college theatricals set him posturing and gyrating and simpering before us, in the nearest approach to girlishness that he can effect. For whatever vanity, whatever weakness, whatever pusillanimity may be innate in the boy, the playing of young women's rôles in these extravaganzas is the perfectest sort of nourishment. Are so many fathers, who wish their sons to become men, are so many thoughtless mothers charmed to behold their sons in the effeminacies of female gear? Do they love to watch them so arrayed, languishing and tripping in public, for money, withal?

I do not discuss here theatricals in women's colleges. In some of them lately, plays containing male characters have been taken up, the male rôles being allotted to young women. In certain instances the classical or other piece thus performed has had a more public audience than seems expedient under such circumstances. Still the average girl playing the man in a toga or in a pair of trowsers is so complete a failure as to amuse. Or, if she have the gift of physique and enough art to tolerably counterfeit the other sex, the presentment is not repulsive. But to watch your young man, after his first teens, acting the woman, the squeaking Cleopatras boying womanishness, is to be disgusted.

Such are "college-theatricals" typically, at present. They are, as such, a discredit and a foe—a foe to the physical and intellectual and moral health of the young American man. Better "rush" than skirt-dance and become an adept in burlesque. Better break legs at football than acquire delicacy in pirouettes or attitudinize like a danseuse, with a corset, tulle skirts, diamonds, and pink nails. We want from our colleges brains, muscle, and manliness—not frivolity and hermaphrodity, ruddled with rouge and imitating the shining ornamentsof certain French courts, passed away in ignominy. It is to the credit of some of our Catholic universities that they have held to the old dignity of intent in undergraduate performances.

The present writer likely will be set down as an unqualified old fogy by a good many people. But he believes that a tolerable contingent of American men and women, even with whiter hair than his, will concur in what is in no case an unkindly or jaundiced consideration of a patent and latent evil in our colleges. And if it be true that it is not expedient for universities concerned to undertake any summary processes of discouragement of the practice of theatricals, there exists at least one preliminary. They should emphatically refuse the university name to those clubs pursuing such a line of amusement, especially if those clubs be largely composed of talent not undergraduate and not strictly of immediate college derivation and permanent connection. Devoid of the university name such a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

club would be no longer active in a line of amusement that reflects no credit on the *alma mater* or on the amateur actors concerned, and would become merely a phase of the general question of ethics and of amateur theatricals of this *fin de siècle* time of ours.

It may also be questioned whether the college banjo-club, glee club and other musical societies have not passed far beyond their allowable field of usefulness. Should it take in their innumerable public entertainments, and the long and thoroughly "professional" tours on the road, from one end of the country to the other, in term-time, and out of it, which lately have been so elaborate and so much applauded by society?

E. IRENÆUS STEVENSON.

LAND HELD OUT OF USE.

IN THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for May, 1893, Wm. B. Cooper replies in the negative to the question, "Is Land Held Out of Use?" He says in effect that the purchase price or rent demanded by landowners does not hold land out of use any more than the cab hire demanded by owners of such vehicles holds cabs out of use, and that deprivation of cabs for out-of-town exercise in the case of sick people may be just as injurious as the impossibility of access to land is in its effect on the unemployed classes.

The parallel does not seem to me a strong one. Invalids may readily find a substitute for prohibited cabs, and enjoy their exercise, the actual benefits of which would be in each case problematical. But as land and labor are the only factors necessary to the production of economic "wealth," or a living, free access to the raw material of nature would be a sure cure for the evils of poverty. Landlordism does not constitute a factor in the production of wealth, its function being merely the collection of rent.

Is land held out of use? Well, on Broadway, in a very desirable business locality, I find a vacant lot, at present surrounded by a bill-board. Why is it not occupied by a great store, hotel, bank or club? Because an enormous premium is demanded by the owner, either in price or rent, for access to it. The site is worth what is asked for it. Many an enterprising man would gladly pay it, *if that ended his payments*, and he were left free to keep for himself the legitimate profits of the business he proposed to build upon the lot. But when he contemplates the municipal and national taxation he will have to face, in addition to his rent—on his building, stock, fixtures, clothes, food, etc., etc.—he hesitates. Under the single-tax system he would be relieved of all these. He would pay ground rent only, but he would pay it to the public till, instead of to the private land-owner.

Mr. Cooper seems to be under the impression that single-taxers propose that the Government should assume the duties of landlordism and dispose of sites to the highest bidders. This is erroneous. It is simply proposed that land and land only shall be assessed each year at its full value and the annual rental value collected as a tax. No "tenant" would be in danger of "being dispossessed by an effective bid" by another, for he would be already paying what was adjudged to be the full value of his location.

J. W. BENGOUGH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED